The Origin and Growth of Sunday Observance in the Christian Church



Joseph Harvey Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS 4
INTRODUCTION 5
THE QUESTION STATED 7
PAGAN ORIGIN OF SUNDAY 15
CONSTANTINE'S MOTIVE 20
PART II 25
SUNDAY ESTABLISHED IN THE CHURCH BY THE PAPACY 25
COUNCIL OF LAODICEA 33
ABUSE OF HISTORY TO AID THE SUNDAY 37
CONSTANTINE'S SECOND SUNDAY LAW 42
CONSTANTINE DID NOT DISPLACE THE SABBATH 44
CATHOLIC CHURCH COUNCILS 47
DECREES OF THE LEOS 51
LETTER OF POPE LEO THE GREAT 56
CATHOLIC FRAUDS FOR SUNDAY 60
SYLVESTER, CONSTANTINE, AND THE LORD'S DAY 62
CANDID SUNDAY HISTORY 74
HISTORY IS NOT BIBLE INTERPRETATION 77

BY J. H. WAGGONER.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
THE QUESTION STATED	7
PAGAN ORIGIN OF SUNDAY	17
CONSTANTINE'S MOTIVE	23
PART II	29
SUNDAY ESTABLISHED IN THE CHURCH BY THE PAPACY	29
COUNCIL OF LAODICEA	39
ABUSE OF HISTORY TO AID THE SUNDAY	44
CONSTANTINE'S SECOND SUNDAY LAW	50
CATHOLIC CHURCH COUNCILS	56
DECREES OF THE LEOS	61
LETTER OF POPE LEO THE GREAT	67
CATHOLIC FRAUDS FOR SUNDAY	72
SYLVESTER, CONSTANTINE, AND THE LORD'S DAY	75
CANDID SUNDAY HISTORY	90
HISTORY IS NOT BIBLE INTERPRETATION	93

INTRODUCTION

It is not the intention of the writer of this pamphlet to give a general view of the subject of the Sabbath and Sunday. The object is to defend the faith of Seventh-day Adventists on the single point of the change of the Sabbath, and who is responsible for that change. On this point our faith has been assailed, and indeed misrepresented, by one who was formerly a minister of the denomination. He made liberal use of his former position to assure his readers that he thoroughly understood our arguments, and was well qualified to present them. Yet he carefully concealed our real arguments, leading his readers to suppose that no such arguments existed.*OGSO 3.1*

Under these circumstances faithfulness to the truth made it imperatively necessary to expose his sophistry. It will be seen from quotations at the beginning of the tract, that he claimed that our only evidence that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath was drawn from the Catholic catechisms; that beside those catechisms we had never been able to present a single item of historical proof that the church changed the Sabbath. For this reason, in order that the reader may more readily and clearly see the incorrectness of his assertions, the testimony of Catholic catechisms and of Catholic authors has been entirely ignored in this argument.*OGSO 3.2*

The writer has been equally careful to exclude the testimony of all those who were favorable to the observance of the Seventh-day Sabbath. Every item of the evidence is from those who favored the keeping of Sunday, and most of it is from those who were ardently in favor of the observance of that day. Therefore it is not too much to say that, as far as our cause is concerned, the evidence of this tract is scrupulously impartial. Indeed, we doubt whether an argument of the same length was ever before published on any subject, in which the testimony of friends was altogether rejected, and only the testimony of opponents used. They who believe in the observance of Sunday will here find a strong array of evidence against the scriptural authority of that day, but that evidence is all their own. And much more of the same kind, from the same sources, could be given.*OGSO 3.3*

Will the reader please imagine, while he reads this work, that another argument is presented, namely, one in favor of the Sunday, in which is given such an array of admissions in its favor from those who keep the seventh day, as is here given from Sunday-keepers. What would he think of their cause? Would he not wonder that any kept the seventh day when the facts of the Bible and history compelled them to prove every point claimed by their opposers,-to yield every point necessary to prove their position? And this is our wonder, now, that any will persist in keeping Sunday when its own friends give such overwhelming testimony against it.*OGSO 4.1*

The “History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week,” by the late J. N. Andrews, is an impartial and truthful history, in which are given such an array of evidences as cannot be gathered in the compass of a tract like this. We recommend it to every reader as the most complete work that has ever been published on this subject.*OGSO 4.2*

Finally, we would call the attention of the reader to the fact that on the subject of the Sabbath, the Bible is not yea and nay. All the plain, clear testimony of the Scriptures is in harmony with the emphatic declaration of Jehovah himself, “The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Everything not in harmony with this is mere inference and human invention. May the Lord give every reader grace to examine the subject with reverence, and with an earnest desire to know and do the will of the Most High. If we tremble at his word now, we may be spared the pain of trembling before him when every work is brought into judgment. *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*.*OGSO 4.3*

THE QUESTION STATED

The subject of the change of the Sabbath and of the proper day to be observed by Christians, is taking a prominent place, not only in the theological, but also in the political, world. Within the last quarter of a century many thousands have become convinced that there is no authority in the Bible for the observance of the first day of the week, and have, accordingly, turned to the observance of the seventh day. Considering that the observance of the seventh day is both unpopular and inconvenient, and that in some localities the laws are framed to make such observance as difficult as possible, it would be strange indeed if everyone who embraced the faith should hold out to the end. If we take the number of converts reported in the most popular revivals, where everything conspires to make the way easy, it is doubtful whether five percent, of the whole can be found in the ranks of Christian workers, five years after their professed conversion. Such being the case, it appears singular to see what an ado is made when a Sabbath-keeper forsakes the faith.*OGSO 7.1*

Of course some ministers, as well as others, have deserted the narrow way. And why not? Ministers have like passions as other men; they are possessed with all the weaknesses of human nature, as well as other men; they are moved by worldly influences, by selfish feelings, as well as other men; and too often influences are thrown around them calculated to arouse their worldly ambition, to an extent which few other men can know. Considering the difficulties that surround the laborers in this cause, compared with the easy lot of ministers in large and popular denominations, we can only regard it as an evidence of the power of the truth, as a special work of divine grace, that the proportion who backslide from the faith and the work is so very small. It is not a strange idea to us that the faith of all shall be tried; that a shaking time is before us, and even now is felt, in which, to use the words of Scripture on another subject, only that which cannot be shaken will remain.*OGSO 8.1*

There lies before me an article written by one who formerly observed and advocated the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. In this article the view held by Seventh-day Adventists on

the question, Who changed the Sabbath? is assailed. It is not my design to follow all the wanderings of this writer, but simply to quote enough from him so that the reader may know just what is the point in dispute, and then, leaving him, to go on with a direct argument which will show the falsity of his charge, by setting forth the truth in the matter.*OGSO 8.2*

His reason for a special assault upon this point is that, as he says, it lies at the foundation of the faith of Seventh-day Adventists, namely, that Sunday-keeping will yet become the mark of the beast. On this he says:-*OGSO 8.3*

"My experience is that a belief of this as a fact induces more persons to give up Sunday for Saturday than all other arguments made by the Seventh-day people. Convince a man that Sunday-keeping is only a Catholic institution, a rival to the Lord's Sabbath, and hateful to God, and, of course, if he has any conscience, he will keep it no longer. Every one of them accepts this as a historical fact in fulfillment of *Daniel 7:25*. Indeed, this is the *one main pillar* in their whole system, upon which all the rest depends. If their position on this point is false, then their whole system of prophetic interpretation is also falser as they will readily admit."*OGSO 9.1*

Our system of faith is largely based on our interpretation of this prophecy; but we have never gone so far as to assert that if our faith on this point is wrong, then the whole literal system of prophetic interpretation is false.*OGSO 9.2*

Proceeding to combat the claim that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, the assailant says:-*OGSO 9.3*

"It would seem that such a bold and radical position should be supported by the clearest and most abundant evidence. They claim it is an actual historical fact that at a certain time, about 500 after Christ, the Pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday. If this be so, of course they should be able to produce reliable historical proof for it, giving the time, place, manner, facts, and reasons for so remarkable an occurrence. I have before me two books written expressly to prove this assertion. They are, 'Who Changed the Sabbath?' 24 pages, and 'Marvel of Nations,' 282 pages. But the only proof offered is simply quotations from Catholic catechisms,

which claim that their church made the change! And is this all the historical proof they can present on this point? Yes, for all that the Sabbatarian writers and scholars for the last 200 years have been able to find is just this and nothing more. Not one single historian in all the annals of the world has ever stated that the Pope changed the Sabbath. For twenty-eight years I longed for such a testimony, but found it not."*OGSO 9.4*

I have thus largely quoted, as this paragraph gives the complete substance of his whole article, that the reader may see exactly what is his claim. The paragraph affords much food for reflection, and opens before our view a large amount of false reasoning.*OGSO 10.1*

1. We learn that for twenty-eight years he longed for what he considered evidence essential to establish the very foundation of the faith that he preached, "but found it not"! While this may or may not be hard on our faith, it is very discreditable to his experience in the ministry, considering that he was so strong and confident in his assertions that the faith he preached was fully and completely proved. His longing for twenty-eight years for proof which he could consider satisfactory shows that he was not as confident as he assumed to be. Is he now?*OGSO 10.2*

2. He does not seem to realize that the question that should govern us on all points of duty is, What say the Scriptures? I have always claimed, and still claim, that proof of the real origin of the Sunday-sabbath is a secondary matter, while it is admitted by very many of its most ardent and learned advocates that its origin cannot be traced to any requirement in the Scriptures. And whether they confess it or not, the fact remains that it is not of Bible origin, plain to the sight of everyone who reads his Bible with any care. A man, "if he has any conscience," will not wait to settle the question of its origin, if he has set before him the evidence that God's law requires the observance of the seventh day, and that the Bible is entirely silent in regard to any other day to be observed as a weekly Sabbath.*OGSO 10.3*

3. He entirely evades the issue, instead of settling it, when he offers proof that the Christians met for worship on the first day of the week

in the days immediately following the apostles. Query: Did they observe it as a Sabbath, or day of rest from secular labor? He knows very well that they did not. He knows, also, if he has ever examined history on the subject, that in those very days Christians assembled for worship on the sixth day also, in commemoration of the death of the Lord, and that neither the first nor the sixth was held as a Sabbath till after the celebrated decree of Constantine for resting on the venerable day of the sun. After that time it was adopted by the Church of Rome and made the "chief festival of the church because it was easier to reach the people if they kept the same day that was popularized by the emperor, and to which they were allied in their adoration of the sun.*OGSO 11.1*

4. He surely cannot be so ignorant of history as to believe, though he affirms it, that the observance of the first day of the week as a day of worship was universal among Christians in "the days immediately following the apostles." I am aware that room for a world of quibbling is opened under the expression, "a day of worship;" because in that manner may be brought in the custom of holding religious worship, and thence repairing to their usual avocations on that day. But that would be a cavil, for he is now considering the erection of the first day as a Sabbath; and the fact that they met for worship on that day is not proof, inasmuch as the proof is clear that they did not rest from labor upon it. After the time of Constantine's decree, and after the Catholic Church had adopted it as the day of special observance, and put the seventh day under its ban, there were many in the Eastern churches who still observed the seventh day, who resisted the usurpation of the Romish Church; and the anathemas of the council held at Laodicea were among the means of bringing them to submit to the change.*OGSO 11.2*

5. Before presenting direct evidence on the question, I will say something on the flourish that is made over our not being able to give time, place, manner, facts, and reasons of the Papacy's erecting the Sunday-sabbath institution. I propose to show that all this can be done, definitely and to a certainty. But I insist that it is not necessary to our position; our faith may be fully and sufficiently established without doing half that he asks. He will find himself by no means so well prepared to defend the Sunday-sabbath as we are to assail it. Let us institute a few comparisons:-*OGSO 12.1*

Suppose that I owe the objector a sum of money; in payment I offer him a bill which he claims is counterfeit. In proof he shows: (*a*) hat the detector gives a very accurate description of the genuine, but this does not resemble it in a single feature. This he thinks ought to settle the matter. (*b*) here is a notorious counterfeiter at hand, who has literally flooded the land with counterfeits; and he has executed them so well that the majority prefer them to the genuine. Of course this emboldens him in his work, and he does not deny his occupation; he rather boasts of his skill in counterfeiting. He comes forward and says that he made that bill; he declares that is one of the best that he ever made. He has even held it up as evidence of his great ability as a counterfeiter. (*c*) Ever since it has been in circulation, there have been officers of the Government who pronounced it a counterfeit. It is further proved that its circulation was resisted by the people, but the counterfeiter got together a company of his confederates, and they resolved to boycott, to waylay, to maltreat all those who would not receive it. And it is shown that these were the means by which it came to be regarded as of any value. (*d*) It is further shown that in all places where he had the controlling influence, they abused and even put to death those who should be found in possession of the genuine. All this the objector offers, to justify his refusal to accept my bill.*OGSO 12.2*

But to this I make, reply, that, (*a*) we cannot take the word of the counterfeiter; his testimony is ruled out. (*b*) It is admitted that everything alleged against the counterfeiter is true, except as regards this particular bill (*c*) It has for so long a time been received as valuable, that custom establishes the fact of its value. Evidences to the contrary are of no weight, (*d*) But, as most decisive of all, I call upon my friend to show the time, place, and manner in which this particular bill was made; he must show the identical tools which were used, and he must plainly declare the facts and reasons which induced the counterfeiter to make this bill. I do not claim that all this can be done in regard to the other counterfeits; it is enough that they stand condemned by the detector. But this is an exceptional case. In regard to this bill I say that he must either show all this, or accept the bill, or lose his debt.*OGSO 13.1*

It is probable that even after all this array of proofs he might still be so exacting as to refuse to receive the bill. But he should not if he

consents to accept the Sunday when it is so plainly condemned by the detector.*OGSO 14.1*

6. To show that I am correct in saying that his claim in regard to this particular institution is exceptional and unreasonable, I now call upon him to show the origin of infant baptism. Let him declare to us the time, place, and manner in which it was instituted. I shall not accept, as proof in the case, instances of its being practiced; these are evidences of its existence, but not of its institution or origin. Let him show the particular facts and reasons which first led to its practice, and when I prove that it was practiced in the days immediately following the apostles, as I hereby offer to do, let him accept it as a valid, Christian ordinance, or renounce the untenable ground upon which he stands. Nor can he evade this by saying that it may be proved that they held meeting for worship on Sunday earlier than the time of the first mention of infant baptism, for meeting for worship on that day gives it no pre-eminence over the sixth day, on which also they held meetings; and I offer to prove that infant baptism was practiced nearly two centuries before there was any observance of the first day, any rest from secular labor required upon it, or any church law or constitution for its observance. If he doubts my ability to do this, it can easily be tested. I am willing to be held to all my offers whenever he comes forward to give the counter evidence.*OGSO 14.2*

7. Infant baptism does not stand alone antedating Sunday-keeping. With it we find sprinkling, first in connection with immersion and then as a substitute for immersion, infant communion, consecrating water in baptism, belief in baptismal regeneration, and many other superstitions. Every one of these can plead the authority of the Fathers, antiquity, the days following the apostles, etc. And every one of them was considered pious and Christian before there was any idea of piety connected with any manner of keeping Sunday. And every one of them claimed, not the teachings of the apostles, but “apostolic traditions.”*OGSO 15.1*

8. Not to be tedious, Ý will notice just one point more: He lays great stress on finding that meetings were held on Sunday in the days immediately following the apostles, and long before the rise of the Papal church. But he cannot find any *Sunday institution* in those

days. And if he could, what then? Paul said the mystery of iniquity was already working in his day, and every true Protestant believes that the mystery of iniquity gave rise to that man of sin-the Papacy. Can the objector point to a single act in the working of that mystery of iniquity in Paul's day, or in the days immediately following the apostles? It was working then, and continued to work until the man of sin stood in full view. But will he undertake to specify a single act in its working in those days? I confidently take this position, and respectfully ask any and all to show that it is not reasonable and just; namely, that practice or institution in the church, not ordained by divine authority, not plainly proved in the Scriptures, which can be traced to the time nearest to the days of the apostles, has the strongest claim to stand first in the working of that mystery of iniquity! If Sunday-keeping stands first among the practices not taught in the Scriptures, then its claim is strongest to be first in the working referred to by the apostle. Paul also said that after his departing grievous wolves should enter in among them, and of their own selves should men arise, speaking perverse things, etc. Admitted that a practice is proved to have existed immediately after the days of Peter and Paul; if it is not authorized by the Scriptures, it is identified as being among the perverse things brought in by grievous wolves, and is to be classed as the working of the mystery of iniquity, by which that man of sin was brought to view. It was his special delight to change the times and laws of the Most High, and to multiply man-made institutions, and to compel their observance as a part of Christianity.*OGSO 15.2*

I might carry much further the comparison between Sunday-keeping and other innovations and superstitions which had their origin in the effort to amalgamate Christianity and paganism. Many of the Fathers had been pagans, not a few of them pagan philosophers, and these were not slow to assume the position of teachers, and to leave their fancies and vagaries on record as the faith of the church. But with all the warnings of the apostles, with all the exhortations to cling to the law and the testimony alone, to the Scriptures of truth, they who follow these false lights away from the words of life, are without excuse.*OGSO 16.1*

Having stated the claims of the opposition, so that all readers may see clearly the point of all the following testimony, we are now at

liberty to leave the caviler and to proceed to the simple argument on the facts of the case.*OGSO 17.1*

PAGAN ORIGIN OF SUNDAY

1. Among all the traditions and human innovations in the Christian church, there is none that can so clearly and positively be traced to paganism as the Sunday.*OGSO 17.2*

2. Among all the institutions which have been foisted upon the church by the Papal power, there is no one that is so clearly marked, so definitely outlined in its origin and enforcement, as the festival of the Sunday.*OGSO 17.3*

I wish here to have it understood that I shall not take the time or the space to examine all the other traditions and superstitions that obtained a foothold in the church, and passed for Christian doctrines and ordinances, so as to draw the comparison and show which is the most distinctively Pagan and Papal. I only take it upon me fully and clearly to show that the Sunday has its origin as a day of regard and observance in Paganism and the Papacy. If any wish to have the comparison more fully traced, and think that they can show that other traditions have a better*OGSO 17.4*

2 right to the claim of such origin, I shall be willing to carry the investigation further, for, though I hope to satisfy every reasonable requirement and every candid mind, I do not propose to exhaust the proofs which are in reach.*OGSO 17.5*

1 Is it a fact that the observance of Sunday as a day of rest from secular employment is distinctively and only of pagan origin?*OGSO 18.1*

To all true Protestants, who take “the Bible and the Bible alone,” who do not believe that their Christian character can be correctly formed by any standard but that which God has revealed, who do not believe there is any obedience where there is no precept or requirement,-to all such the plea of custom and tradition can have no weight. In regard to any custom, our inquiry is not, Did it exist? but, By what authority did it exist? We have little regard *for what men have done*; that does not reach our consciences; for that we go to history, and then we are often misinformed. We ask *what they ought to have done*, and to settle this we go to the Bible, and are

never deceived. And none can be deceived in going there, unless its testimony is covered up with inferences and traditions. I wish the reader to bear in mind what justly belongs to the examination of duty in regard to laws and institutions. The only question admissible is, What does the commandment of God say? Has it been as plainly amended or repealed as it was enacted? If not, no amount of tradition, custom, precedent, or reasoning can set it aside. But we are constantly going beyond what can be reasonably asked of us, and proving that their traditions and customs are vain and their conclusions are unjust.*OGSO 18.2*

In answering the question I have asked on the first proposition, I shall show that *the authority, the name*, and the *sacredness* Sunday are entirely of pagan origin.*OGSO 19.1*

Everyone who has read the debate between Campbell and Purcell must have been struck with Mr. Campbell's perfect familiarity with church history. The bishop appeared to be unusually fair for an advocate of "the church," but on one point he was either inclined to take unjust advantage, or Mr. Campbell excelled him in a knowledge of church history and the writings of the Fathers. Mr. Campbell was an advocate of Sunday-keeping; in his theology, Sunday was the Lord's day. But his learning often led him to make statements with which his theology was not in harmony. He was president of Bethany College, in Virginia, a denominational institution. Before a graduating class in the year 1848, he used the following language:-*OGSO 19.2*

"Was the first day set apart by public authority in the apostolic age?-No. By whom was it set apart? and when?-By Constantine, who lived about the beginning of the fourth century."*OGSO 19.3*

These words I copied from the *Proclamation and Reformer*, at that time published in Cincinnati, the lecture having been revised by Mr. Campbell himself before its publication. According to this, Constantine was the one-the first one-who set apart by authority the first day of the week. Constantine's Sunday decree was issued in 321. Dr. Heylyn, in his "History of the Sabbath," an extensive and reliable work, speaking of their holding meetings on Sunday, said:-*OGSO 19.4*

"For three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it nor any rest from labor, or from worldly business required upon it."-*Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 12*.OGSO 20.1

In a subsequent section of the same part (2) of his work, he said:-OGSO 20.2

"Tertullian tells us that they did devote the Sunday partly unto mirth and recreation, not to devotion altogether; when in a hundred years after Tertullian time, there was no law nor constitution to restrain men from labor in this day, in the Christian Churches"-*Id. chap. 8, sec. 13*.OGSO 20.3

These testimonies are exactly in harmony with that of Mr. Campbell. He says that Constantine was the first to set apart the first day of the week. This was in 321. Heylyn says there was no law for three hundred years. This would throw it forward to the time of Constantine. He also says it was a hundred years after Tertullian's time. This is not definite, nor is the time of Tertullian's death known. Authorities point to about 221, or not long after, as the date of Tertullian's death; and this again points to the time of Constantine for the first Sunday law.OGSO 20.4

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who, with Heylyn, was a Church of England writer, said:-OGSO 20.5

'The primitive Christians did all manner of work upon the Lord day, even in the times of persecutions, when they were the strictest observers of all the divine commandments; but in this they knew there was none; and therefore, when Constantine, the emperor, had made an edict against working on the Lord's day, yet he excepts and still permitted all agriculture or labors of the husbandmen whatsoever."-*Ductor Dubitantium, Part I, book 2, chap. 2*.OGSO 20.6

The "Encyclopædia Britannica," ninth edition (art. Sunday) says:-OGSO 21.1

"The earliest recognition of the observance of Sunday as a legal duty is a constitution of Constantine in 321 a. d., enacting that all courts of justice, inhabitants of towns, and workshops were to be at

rest on Sunday (*venerabili die Solis*), with an exception in favor of those engaged in agricultural labor."*OGSO 21.2*

"Chambers. Encyclopedia" says of Sunday:-*OGSO 21.3*

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that day is known to have been enjoined, is the edict of Constantine, 321 a. d."-*Art. Sabbath*.*OGSO 21.4*

These are a very few of the very many testimonies at hand which definitely state that the law of Constantine was the first law which set apart the first day of the week, or required rest from secular work on Sunday. More are not necessary to quote, from the fact that not a single authority can be produced that gives any other date or authority for the first Sunday law. If anyone takes exception to this statement, will he please name a single historian who has ever given any other date, or any other authority? Until he does at least this much-until he shows that there is some difference of opinion, some disagreement among learned and reliable authors, on the subject, I shall claim that this part of my proposition is fully and sufficiently proved. The value of these testimonies is better appreciated by considering the fact that the witnesses were all friends and advocates of Sunday-keeping.*OGSO 21.5*

Having thus fixed the origin of *the authority*, we will next look for the origin of *the name* of the institution that Constantine set apart. It is found in the law itself, which is as follows:-*OGSO 21.6*

"Let all the judges and towns-people, and the occupation of all trades, rest upon the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty, attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven."*OGSO 22.1*

Thus in the first law for the observance of the day, it was designated the day of the sun. Not a very high or honorable title. How came this title to be given to it? The "Religious Encyclopædia" says:-*OGSO 22.2*

“The ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun.”*OGSO 22.3*

According to this, the title originated in heathen idolatry. Do authorities agree upon this? Yes; there is not an author in all the rounds of history or literature who dissents from this. Webster says:-*OGSO 22.4*

“The heathen nations in the north of Europe dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday.”*OGSO 22.5*

The Sunday-school “Union Bible Dictionary” says:-*OGSO 22.6*

“Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun.”*OGSO 22.7*

Worcester, in his dictionary, says:-*OGSO 22.8*

“Sunday; so named because anciently dedicated to the sun or its worship.”*OGSO 22.9*

These authors give an ancient origin to the name. Constantine was not the originator of the title which he gave to the day. Another historian, Morer, says:-*OGSO 22.10*

“It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshiped the sun, and, as a standing memorial of their veneration, dedicated this day to him.”-*Dialogues on the Lord’s Day, p. 22.*OGSO 23.1*

Thus it is shown that the title that Constantine gave to the day in the first Sunday law, is an ancient one, and is entirely of heathen origin. From this statement, also, there is and can be no dissent. The advocates of Sunday sacredness must stand silent before these evidences.*OGSO 23.2*

CONSTANTINE'S MOTIVE

Having found that the first law for Sunday rest gave it a heathen title, that the name is altogether of heathen origin, I proceed to inquire on what basis the law stood, that is, what was the nature of the edict-what the motive which actuated Constantine in giving this decree? This also can be settled to a certainty. Many interested religionists, with far more zeal than piety or regard for the precepts of Jehovah, speak of Constantine's edict as a law for the Christian observance of the Lord's day. The very title that he gave it, the origin of that title, and the known use of the title in those times, disprove their assertion. Indeed, their knowledge of the origin of the title ought to cause them to blush when they make such assertions. But our proof is explicit on the point of the motive that gave rise to the first Sunday law. We are not straitened for testimonies in regard to this; they are so numerous that I cannot give a tithe of them. And their importance on the subject under consideration cannot be overestimated.*OGSO 23.3*

1. The fact that Constantine gave it the title by which it was known in pagan worship, shows that it was not enforced as a Christian institution.*OGSO 24.1*

2. It was dated March 7, 321, and on the next day, March 8, he issued a decree for the examination of the entrails of beasts, for the determination of portents, or for ascertaining the causes of public calamities. This was a heathen custom, and showed the heathenism and superstitions that swayed his mind at that time.*OGSO 24.2*

3. At the time when these decrees were issued, he had made no profession of Christianity. Indeed, authorities have been quite willing to place the time of his professed conversion after the time when he presided over the Council of Nicæa, that it might be after the commission of many of his most perfidious and criminal acts.*OGSO 24.3*

4. Historians freely testify that at and after the time of issuing his Sunday decree, he was a worshiper of Apollo, the sun-god, and to the close of his life, about 337, retained the title of Pontifex

Maximus, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy.*OGSO 24.4*

Milman, in the "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 1, says:-*OGSO 24.5*

"It is the day of the sun which is to be observed by the general veneration; the courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce, without scruple, in the sanctity of the first day of the week."*OGSO 24.6*

This is well expressed. It was, indeed, a new phase of paganism; for, though the venerable day of the sun had long-very long-been venerated by them and their heathen ancestors, the idea of rest from worldly labor in its worship was entirely new. Gibbon also gives a clear testimony on the character of Constantine as a sun-worshiper. In chapter 20, paragraph 3, of "History of the Decline and Fall of the Empire," he says:-*OGSO 25.1*

"The devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the God of light and poetry.... The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity.... The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."*OGSO 25.2*

In a note to the above is found the following:-*OGSO 25.3*

"The panegyric of Eumenius which was pronounced a few months before the Italian war, abounds with the most unexceptionable evidence of the pagan superstition of Constantine and of his particular veneration of Apollo, or the sun."*OGSO 25.4*

Dr. Hessey, in his "Bampton Lectures," p. 60, says:-*OGSO 25.5*

"Others have looked at the transaction in a totally different light, and

refused to discover in the document, or to suppose in the mind of the enactor, any recognition of the Lord's day as a matter of divine obligation They remark, and very truly, that Constantine designates it by its astrological or heathen title *Dies Solis*, and insist that the epithet *venerabilis* with which it is introduced has reference to the rites performed on that day in honor of Hercules, Apollo, or Mithras."*OGSO 25.6*

Keightly, "History of Rome," speaking of Constantine at and after his profession of Christianity, says:-*OGSO 26.1*

"Constantine, however, was still a polytheist, and his principal object of worship was the sun-god, Apollo. At the same time, with the compliant spirit of polytheism, he held the God of the Christians and the Author of their faith in respect and reverence."*OGSO 26.2*

And Dr. Schaff testifies to exactly the same thing; in his "Church History," vol. 2, pp. 14, 15, he says:-*OGSO 26.3*

"At first Constantine, like his father, in the spirit of Neo-platonic syncretism of dying heathendom, reverenced all the gods as mysterious powers, especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts. Nay, so late as the year 321, he enjoined the regular consultation of the soothsayers in public misfortunes, according to ancient heathen usage; even later, he placed his new residence, Byzantium, under the protection of the God of the martyrs and the heathen goddess of fortune; and down to the end of his life he retained the title and dignity of Pontifex Maximus, or high priest of the heathen hierarchy. His coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ, on the other side the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, *Sol Invictus*."*OGSO 26.4*

On this point in regard to Constantine's Christianity after he professed it, the "Religious Encyclopedia" says:-*OGSO 26.5*

"The notion of conversion in the sense of a real acceptance of the new religion and a thorough rejection of the old, is inconsistent with the hesitating attitude in which he stood toward both. Much of this may indeed be due to motives of political expediency, but there is a good deal that cannot be so explained. Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, almost down to the

close of his life, retained so many pagan superstitions. He was at best only half heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins, and ordaining the observance of Sunday under the name of *dies solis* in his celebrated decree of March, 321, though such, a combination was far from uncommon in the first Christian centuries. Perhaps the most significant illustration of the ambiguity of his religious position is furnished by the fact that in the same year in which he issued his Sunday decree, he gave orders that if lightning struck the imperial palace, or any public building, the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use."*OGSO 26.6*

Mosheim, in "Historical Commentaries" (century 4, section 7, note 1), on the same point says:-*OGSO 27.1*

"How long Constantine retained these vague and undecided views of religion and religious worship, regarding the Christian religion as excellent, and salutary to the Roman State, yet not esteeming other religions, or those of inferior gods, as vain, pernicious, and odious to God, ... it is difficult to determine. Zosimus, as is well known, reports that Constantine did not openly profess Christianity, and show himself hostile to the Romish sacred rites until after the slaughter of his son Crispus and his wife Fausta; which truly detestable crimes were perpetrated in the year 326."*OGSO 27.2*

It cannot be disguised that, at the time of issuing his Sunday decree, he was a pagan of no very high grade; and his profession of Christianity never raised him much above the average pagan. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" gives a just estimate of his character. Speaking of the title of "The Great" being conferred upon him, it says:-*OGSO 27.3*

"Tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet has in ancient or modern times been applied."*OGSO 28.1*

Dr. Schaff is justly esteemed as a man of extensive learning, and whose testimony regarding facts no one would call in question. He is a theologian, and a warm friend of Sunday-keeping. But his

theological relations have not prevented his giving the facts in to the first Sunday law. He says:-*OGSO 28.2*

“He enjoined the observance, or, rather, forbade the public desecration, of Sunday, not under the name of *Sabbatum* or *dies Domini*, but under its own astrological or heathen title, *dies solis*, familiar to all his subjects, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Hercules, Apollo, or Mithras, as to the Christians.”-*History of the Christian Church, period 3, sec. 2*.*OGSO 28.3*

And indeed it was more applicable to the worshipers of Hercules, Apollo, or Mithras, than to Christians, for it referred to heathen, and not at all to Christian, worship. Again Dr. Schaff says:-*OGSO 28.4*

“He enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini* but as *dies solis*, in conformity to his worship of Apollo, and in Company with an ordinance for the regular consultation of the haruspex, 321.”-*Id.**OGSO 28.5*

Concerning its claim to be considered a sacred day, it is not necessary to add much to what has already been said by the writers quoted. It would be presumption in the extreme to claim that God ever conferred any blessing or sanctification directly upon it. By a system of false reasoning, they try to make out that the blessing that was conferred upon the seventh day was transferred to the first; but of course no scripture is ever quoted to justify the claim. The authorities here given say that it was dedicated to the sun; and that dedication is its only claim to sanctity. J In perfect harmony with these, is the following from the “Douay Catechism:”-*OGSO 28.6*

“It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination, *dies solis*, the day of the sun, *to which it was sacred*.”*OGSO 29.1*

PART II

SUNDAY ESTABLISHED IN THE CHURCH BY THE PAPACY

Now as far as the first proposition is concerned, I think I have done all that I proposed; I have given such proofs, and such an abundance of them, that every candid person must admit that it is clearly proved that the name, origin, authority, and sacredness of the Sunday institution are altogether and only pagan. Thus far there is not a Christian feature about it. With great confidence I approach the examination of the second question, for which the way is so well prepared. But in passing, I will say that I have carefully avoided giving the testimony of anyone who was committed in favor of Sabbath-keeping. Every author quoted was in favor of the Sunday. If ever anybody had a right to feel confident in his position, we surely have in regard to the assertion that the Sunday is, in every feature, a heathen institution.*OGSO 29.2*

Is the institution of Sunday, as a church festival, or day of Christian observance, of Papal origin? In other words, did the Papacy set up the Sunday in the church as a substitute for the Sabbath of the Lord?*OGSO 30.1*

Let it be understood that when we speak of *the Papacy*, or of *the Papal power*, we refer, not to *the Popes* merely, but to *that church system* of which the Pope was the head. In the quotation given on page 9, there is found a careless expression which ought to be noticed, lest the reader be misled to take a wrong view of our position. The writer says: “They claim it as an actual historical fact that ... the Pope did change the Sabbath to Sunday.” And, “the only proof offered is simply quotations from Catholic catechisms.” But Catholic catechisms *never* claim that *the Pope* changed the Sabbath to Sunday. They always declare that *the church* changed the Sabbath; and it is known to everyone who has any knowledge of these matters, that the legislative power of the church lay in the councils. True, the Pope was the head of the church, and as such he had great influence in the action of the councils. His headship grew out of the primacy which was settled upon the bishop of Rome by the first general Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325. The primacy was

given to the bishop of Rome as bishop of *the imperial city*; but the Popes, in general letters or declarations of the faith, gave the decisions of the councils as their authority. And this was the recognized relative position that the Popes and councils maintained toward each other as long as the emperors convened the councils. Instances are not wanting of the "Christian emperors" giving effect to the decrees of the councils, in imitation of Constantine, who confirmed the acts of the Council of Nicæa. That church, that hierarchy, of which the bishop of Rome was primate, and of which he became the head or sovereign pontiff through the acts of its councils, confirmed by the Popes and emperors, changed the Sabbath to Sunday. This is exactly what they claim, and all history attests that their claim is just, as I propose to show.*OGSO 30.2*

It is easy to see where the advocates of Sunday fail to apprehend the truth on this point. Their failure no doubt lies right here: they do not appreciate the fact that almost everything that is attributed to the Catholic Church, and can be traced to no other source, is more or less veiled in obscurity as to its origin. I invite them to take up in order the institutions which are attributed to the Papacy, and show the precise or exact origin of each. For instance: Do they believe that the Popes of Rome ever exercised civil power? They must answer in the affirmative. Will they inform us when and where that power was conferred, or how they took that power? And if they cannot clearly and satisfactorily do that, will they therefore deny that the Popes ever exercised that power? or will they assert that their power must be of divine origin? A Catholic work now before me, entitled, "Pope Pius IX," and published "with the approbation of the Lord Bishop of Beverly" (Sadlier, New York), speaking of this, says:-*OGSO 31.1*

"And now we approach a most important topic-the rise of the temporal power of the Popes. There is this which plainly marks it as the gradual, silent work of God: No one can point with precision and certainty to the precise time when it did rise.... It grew as the trees grow from the soil. You cannot say when the acorn first bursts its shell and the lordly oak springs forth. Tell me whence the broad river draws its waters; tell me of all the streams, all the little rivulets and fountains, that feed it, and I will then tell you every source which gave rise to the temporal sovereignty of the Popes. Like

everything natural, everything providential, we can only catch indications of it here and there, in the days of its infancy, for I speak of times long before Charlemagne."*OGSO 32.1*

Very few of the dogmas called Papal can be traced to their origin. As seen above, the Catholics base their claim on this fact, that you cannot mark their origin, that, being believed or practiced so early, they must have been derived from the apostles. This is exactly the popular argument for Sunday. But Archbishop Whately drew an argument against them from this very fact; inasmuch as the Scriptures thoroughly furnish the man of God to all good works, if these dogmas were of divine institution we could easily trace them to their divine origin-to the word of God. It matters not a whit who or how many kept Sunday, or how near to the time of the apostles it was kept. Did God command it? do the Scriptures thoroughly furnish us with proofs for its observance? Lacking this, it lacks everything that is required to make it a Christian ordinance.*OGSO 32.2*

I do not make these remarks because they apply particularly to the Sunday; I do not admit that it stands with the other Papal institutions, veiled in even comparative obscurity. In this respect it has a prominence all its own-it can be traced to the Papal power without the least shadow cast upon the evidence. I am confident that I can point out the two springs which, more than all others, gave rise to the baleful stream of temporal church power. But I have called attention to the obscurity of the origin of Papal dogmas, solely to show that the advocates of Sunday are inconsistent and unreasonable in their claim; they ask for the Sunday what they cannot begin to give for other institutions which they freely admit are of Papal origin. Fortunately, we can meet their most unreasonable demand with full and sufficient proof, as I shall now show.*OGSO 32.3*

The reader will bear witness that the origin of the Sunday as a day of rest from labor, has been clearly shown; it is only pagan. We have now to consider its authority as a church institution. I shall show that the Papacy took it up from the hands of the emperors, and strictly enforced its observance, and took most effective steps to suppress and utterly abolish the observance of the seventh-day

Sabbath. It is claimed that on this point we depend entirely on the catechisms of the Catholic Church; that after 200 years of searching, Sabbath-keepers have not been able to find an item of reliable history to prove their position and to justify their faith. We shall let facts show the falsity of this charge.*OGSO 33.1*

Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, was the first to speak of the transfer of the honors and duties of the Sabbath to Sunday. Let the reader carefully note this important fact. His words are as follows:-*OGSO 33.2*

"And all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these, we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has the precedence, and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath."-*Commentary on Psalm 92*.*OGSO 34.1*

I cannot give the room for all the notice that this first Sunday-sabbath testimony deserves. The Lord in his own institution doubtless knew best to which day the duties were most appropriate, and which day was most honorable. See *Isaiah 58:13*. In this transaction the pronoun "we" cuts a great figure-much greater than it will be able to maintain in the day when God shall bring every work into judgment on the authority of his commandments. *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*; *Romans 2:12, 16*. Eusebius did not intend to disparage the transfer of Sabbath obligation; he was the obsequious flatterer of Constantine, and fully coincided with his decree in favor of the venerable day of the sun; and he never failed to speak in a manner to tickle the vanity of his royal patron. He spoke the exact truth in regard to the transfer. That the church took it up and united with the emperors in enforcing its observance, Dr. Heylyn, a historian of undisputed veracity and of unbounded research, testifies thus:-*OGSO 34.2*

"And as the day of rest from labors, and restraint from business upon that day, it received its greatest strength from the supreme magistrate as long as he retained that power which to him belongs; as after from the canons and decrees of councils, the decretals of Popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them."-*History of the*

Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 3, sec. 12.*OGSO 34.3*

Bearing in mind that it has been fully proved that the decree of Constantine was the first authority for Sunday rest, I ask if here is not a most important item of reliable history in proof of our position? Of the times more than a century later than Constantine, Heylyn speaks thus of the building up of this institution:-*OGSO 34.4*

"The faithful, being united better than before, became more uniform in matters of devotion; and in that uniformity did agree together to give the Lord's day all the honors of an holy festival. Yet was not this done all at once, but by degrees, the fifth and sixth centuries being well-nigh spent before it came into that height which hath since continued. The emperors and the prelates in these times had the same affections, being earnest to advance this day above all other; and to the edicts of the one, and ecclesiastical constitutions of the other, it stands indebted for many of those privileges and exemptions which it still enjoyeth."-*History of the Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 4, sec. 1*.*OGSO 35.1*

One of the most effectual means of degrading the Sabbath, and of exalting the Sunday above it, in the feelings and practice of the people, was to make the Sabbath a fast-day, and to forbid fasting on the Sunday. A rigidly enforced fast is always burdensome to any people; and while the Sabbath was made a gloomy day to them, everything was done that could be, to make the Sunday a day of personal enjoyment. It is easy to tell which day would become the popular one, under such circumstances. This was the course pursued by the governors of the church, as all historians testify. It was a shrewd step in the direction of an entire change of the day of Sabbath observance. But it was not by any one step that this change was brought about. Nor was it a brief work. As the historian says, it was not done all at once, but by degrees. Dr. Hase in his "Church History" (Part 1, div. 2, A. D. 100-312, sec. 69) thus testifies:-*OGSO 35.2*

"The Roman Church regarded Saturday as a fast-day, in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath. Sunday remained a joyful festival, in which all fasting and worldly business was avoided as much as possible, but the original commandment of

the decalogue respecting the Sabbath was not then applied to that day."*OGSO 36.1*

This practice, "in direct opposition to those who regarded it as a Sabbath," was altogether of Rome. The Eastern churches long refused to comply with this order, as Dr. Heylyn testifies:-*OGSO 36.2*

"In this difference it stood a long time together, till in the end the Roman Church obtained the cause, and Saturday became a fast almost through all parts of the Western world. I say the Western world, and of that alone, the Eastern churches being so far from altering their ancient custom that in the sixth council of Constantinople, A. D. 692, they did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day, upon pain of censure."-*History of the Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 2, sec. 3.OGSO 36.3*

But Rome prevailed. It was decreed by the Council of Nicæa, and confirmed by Constantine, that "the primacy should remain with Rome;" and, though the Eastern churches long resisted the usurpations of the Roman bishops, this decree was never reversed, and the emperors were diligent to see that it was enforced. As long as the primacy of Rome was acknowledged, and maintained by the emperors, of course the faith promulgated by Rome was "Catholic," and all dissenters were heretics, to be punished with anathemas from the church, and more immediate penalties by the emperors. The action of Justinian, who fully established the supremacy of the Pope (*John 2.*), is proof as strong as any can require, that the emperors stood at nothing that could make effective the Roman faith. The following is from Bower's "History of the Popes," vol. 1, p. 334:-*OGSO 36.4*

"While the Arian king was striving by the most just and equitable laws to clear the church from all simony in the West, the Catholic emperor was employing the most unjust and unchristian means of clearing her from all heresies in the East, that of persecution, and the most cruel persecution any Christian emperor had yet set on foot or countenanced. For by an edict which he issued to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, such as did not, in the space of three months, embrace and profess the Catholic

faith, were declared infamous, and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the Catholic faith; but many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the utmost rigor. Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked."*OGSO 37.1*

Such were the means by which people came to the unity of the faith in the early church. It must be borne in mind that Justinian and other emperors did not declare any faith,-they simply enforced the faith which had been declared by the Catholic bishops and councils. And what was the declared faith and practice of the Catholic Church, in regard to the Sabbath and Sunday, in the time of this inhuman conduct of Justinian? Leo the Great was made Pope a little less than a century before Justinian's execrable action in behalf of the church. Of Leo, "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia" says:-*OGSO 37.2*

"Leo 1., saint and Pope, surnamed The Great, noted as the real founder of the Papacy."*OGSO 38.1*

He was the real founder of the Papacy in this sense, that he did more than all his predecessors to subject all the churches to the authority of the Roman bishops; and Bower represents his course, in the accomplishment of this purpose, as dishonorable, unscrupulous, utterly unworthy of anyone bearing the name of a Christian. But it is enough that he put forth every effort to establish the Papacy that he should be sainted; it is this that covers all sins in their estimation. The character and position of Leo cannot but be appreciated in connection with the upbuilding of the Sunday institution. The *Bibliotheca Sacra* has an article on the subject of the change of Sabbath, written by Rev. L. Coleman, author of "Ancient Christianity Exemplified." In this article he speaks as follows:-*OGSO 38.2*

"The reasons for keeping the first day in preference to the seventh have been already stated from Justin Martyr. They are more fully explained by Leo the Great, of the fifth century. On this day the

world had its origin. On the same day, through the resurrection of Christ, death came to an end, and life began. It was upon this day also that the apostles were commissioned by the Lord to preach the gospel to every creature, and to offer to all the world the blessings of salvation. On the same day came Christ into the midst of his disciples, and breathed upon them, saying, Receive the Holy Ghost. And finally, on this day the Holy Ghost was shed upon the apostles. So that we see *as it were* an ordinance from Heaven evidently set before us, showing that on this day, on which all the gifts of God's grace have been vouchsafed, we ought to celebrate the solemnities of Christian worship."-*Vol. 1, pp. 533, 534*.*OGSO 38.3*

This expression of Pope Leo is, indeed, a very important document- important because of the position of the author; of the influence he exerted over the church, which, as we here see, is not lost even to the present day; important as most fully explaining the reasons for keeping Sunday, not one of which the Scriptures ever noticed; important as an example, showing how an ordinance from Heaven can be deduced from a Papal "as it were." And if such respect is paid to these words of Pope Leo the Great, in this century, by a leading Protestant publication in America, what must have been their influence, their force, when Leo had supreme control over the faith of Christendom, and was backed by the authority of the emperors? In the entire absence of evidence from the Scriptures, in favor of the Sunday institution, what can we think of the knowledge or frankness of a man who will affirm that not an item of history can be produced to show that the Papacy changed the Sabbath?*OGSO 38.4*

COUNCIL OF LAODICEA

As decisive as is this evidence, it is not the strongest that we have to offer. Historians, early and late, of all beliefs, have made much mention of the action of the Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364. McClintock and Strong make the following statement:-*OGSO 39.1*

"Chrysostom (A. D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest on the Lord's day."*OGSO 39.2*

This puts it very mild indeed. In regard to the influence of the decisions of this council, they say:-*OGSO 39.3*

"Sixty canons were published, which were accepted by the other churches."*OGSO 40.1*

In their synopsis of these, they say:-*OGSO 40.2*

"Canon 29 forbids Christians observing the Jewish Sabbath."*OGSO 40.3*

In these two statements we get the whole truth: 1. It enjoined the observance of the first day of the week. 2. It forbade the observance of the Sabbath. Let it be remembered that this council was held in less than half a century from the time when Constantine issued his first decree, for the first observance of the venerable day of the sun as a day of rest from labor. As the historian says, it was taken from the hands of the emperors by Popes and councils, and rest enforced upon it as a Christian festival. I will here copy the original, as given by the council itself, in Latin:-*OGSO 40.4*

"Quod non oportet Christianos Judaizare, et in Sabbato otiari, sed ipsos eo die operari: diem autem Dominicum preferentes otiari, si modo possint, ut Christianos. Quod si inventi fuerint Judaizantes sint anathema apud Christos."*OGSO 40.5*

The following is a translation:-*OGSO 40.6*

"Christians ought not to Judaize, and to rest in the Sabbath, but to

work in that day; but, preferring the Lord's day, should rest, if possible, as Christians. Wherefore if they shall be found to Judaize, let them be accursed from Christ."*OGSO 40.7*

There is no necessity that I should take another step to fully establish my propositions. It is abundantly, proved, beyond all chance of denial, that the first law of any kind for resting from worldly labor on the first day of the week, was that of Constantine, who commanded only certain classes to rest upon it as the venerable day of the sun, in conformity with his worship of Apollo, the sun-god. And in less than half a century after that time, a Catholic council enacted a canon which was accepted as orthodox, which not only contained the first formal church law for the observance of the Sunday, but likewise forbade the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, under penalty of being accursed from Christ! Now, if anyone can imagine what would be changing the Sabbath if this is not, I would be extremely happy to learn what it could be. In less than half a century after Constantine's first Sunday decree, we find this sweeping canon of the Council of Laodicea. In less than a century after the publication of this canon, Leo the Great gave his decision in the most emphatic terms, that the Sunday was the day specially honored of the Lord, and ought to be specially honored by Christians. And in less than a century after Leo's decision, Justinian subjected all, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, to the Catholic faith, of which the substitution of the Sunday for the Sabbath was a prominent part, of which they had to make a public profession within three months, under penalty of being declared infamous, excluded from all employments, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and having their estates, of whatever nature, confiscated.*OGSO 40.8*

Now, it being clearly shown that a part of the Catholic faith to which they were subjected, under such severe penalties, was that people should not rest on the Sabbath, and that they should not work on the Sunday, is it a wonder that, under the canons of councils, the decision of Popes, given under penalty of being accursed from Christ, and enforced by the edicts of emperors, under such penalties as were rigorously inflicted by Justinian,-is it a wonder that the observance of Sunday became so prevalent throughout the empire? Is it not rather a wonder that so many clung to the Sabbath

of the Lord, even in those perilous times, as history attests there did, in spite of the terrible persecutions to which they were subjected? And is it not still more wonderful that Protestant ministers, with all these facts of history within their reach, will gravely point to this prevalence of Sunday-keeping as evidence of the united faith of the Christian church in favor of the first-day Sabbath? And most wonderful of all, a minister comes forward and informs the public, in all apparent seriousness, that he has left the Sabbath of the fourth commandment for a more pious observance, because that, after very extensive research for more than a score of years, he has learned that Sabbatarians have never been able to produce an item of reliable history to prove that the Catholic Church changed the Sabbath; that all we have to offer to prove or to defend our faith, is the evidence of the Catholic catechism! Who can add a comment worthy of such an occasion as this?*OGSO 41.1*

While I have fully proved my proposition, I have presented but a tithe of the evidence that is ready at my hand. In "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," p. 531, Coleman says, in reference to the decrees of the Council of Laodicea:-*OGSO 42.1*

"Christian emperors confirmed and extended these decrees. All public shows, theatrical exhibitions, dancing, and amusements, were strictly prohibited. Similar decrees were also passed by various councils, requiring a faithful attendance upon public worship, and a strict observance of the day, by solemn suspension of all secular pursuits, and abstinence from amusements and vain recreations. The Council of Laodicea, canon 29, about the same time forbade the observance of the Jewish Sabbath."*OGSO 42.2*

Coleman is an ardent advocate of Sunday, but he has presented the most incontestible proof of the truthfulness of our position. And in these statements he has but spoken in Harmony with all history. Let us mark well the words of Coleman. Speaking of the imperial decrees, he adds: "Similar decrees were also passed *by various councils*, requiring a faithful attendance upon public worship, and a strict observance of the day," etc. These were church laws, compelling the strict observance of Sunday, and faithful attendance upon public worship on that day, and holding an ecclesiastical curse over those who kept the Sabbath; and this action was taken by

various councils.*OGSO 43.1*

It is a historical fact that the edict of Constantine, and the imprecation of the Council of Laodicea, and the letter of Leo, and the cruelties of Justinian, and other like contemporaneous acts, all together were not successful in entirely overthrowing the observance of the Sabbath, and in making the observance of the Sunday universal. Against this almost overwhelming tide of worldly power and influence and wickedness, witnesses for God's downtrodden commandment were constantly rising up. This is made clear by the action of subsequent councils, even if we had no other testimony. But for the present we will notice further the interesting period from Constantine to Justinian.*OGSO 43.2*

ABUSE OF HISTORY TO AID THE SUNDAY

Sylvester was bishop of Rome during most of the reign of Constantine. He decreed that Sunday should be called the Lord's day. But this could affect the Church of Rome only; for the bishop of Rome had not at that time attained to any authority whatever above the other bishops. True, while the mystery of iniquity was working, and countless superstitions were being introduced, especially in the African churches, this day was called the Lord's day before the time of Sylvester; but his order was the first *authority* for calling it so. And now, in considering another decree from Constantine, I wish to call especial attention to the frauds which have so long been practiced- and are still, not only among Catholics but Protestants as well- concerning the application of this title of Lord's day. Eusebius ("Life of Constantine") says:-*OGSO 44.1*

"He enjoined on all the subjects of the Roman Empire to observe the Lord's day as a day of rest.... And since his desire was to teach his whole army zealously to honor the Saviour's day, which derives its name from light, and from the sun, he freely granted to those who were among them who were partakers of the divine faith, leisure for attendance on the service of the church of God, in order that they might be able, without impediment, to perform their religious worship. With regard to those who were yet ignorant of divine truth, he provided by a second statute that they should appear on each Lord's day on an open plain, near the city, and there, at a given signal, offer to God with one accord a prayer which they had previously learnt."-*Book 4, chap.18, 19.OGSO 44.2*

It has not been my lot to see the decree concerning the prayer to be recited by his pagan soldiers, though Eusebius gives the form of the prayer, which was well adapted to pagan soldiery!*OGSO 45.1*

The following is Chapter 20, Book IV, entire, of Eusebius's "Life of Constantine" (Bagster, 1845):-*OGSO 45.2*

CHAPTER 20.*OGSO 45.3*

THE FORM OF PRAYER GIVEN BY CONSTANTINE TO H SOLDIERS.*OGSO 45.4*

“We acknowledge Thee the only God; we own Thee as our King, and implore thy succor. By thy favor have we gotten the victory; through Thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for Thy past benefits, and trust Thee for future blessings. Together we pray to Thee, and beseech Thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our Emperor Constantine and his pious sons.”*OGSO 45.5*

“Such was the duty to be performed on Sunday by his troops, and such the prayer they were instructed to offer up to God.”*OGSO 45.6*

Nor have I thought it of sufficient consequence to search for it, if indeed it exists, but the reader might easily infer from the words here quoted, that Constantine did really give some order in regard to the Sunday under the title of the Lord’s day, though Eusebius says that it derives its name from the sun. We shall see if he did.*OGSO 45.7*

Reference has often been made by many authors to Constantine’s edict concerning the emancipation of slaves on the Lord’s day. Coleman says:-*OGSO 45.8*

“No sooner was Constantine established upon the throne, than he began to bestow especial care upon the observance of the Lord’s day. He required his armies to spend the day in devotional exercises. No courts of judicature were to be held on this day; no suits or trials in law prosecuted; but at the same time, works of mercy, such as the emancipation of slaves, were declared lawful.”-*Bibliotheca Sacra, vol.1, p. 534**OGSO 45.9*

These words of Coleman are not marked with that accuracy that should mark the words of a faithful historian. It was not as soon as he was established upon his throne that he began his work. His victory over Maxentius was in A. D. 312, and his first edict for a partial rest on the sun’s day was in 321. Requiring them to say a prayer, which is contained in a few lines, and contains not a single element of Christian faith, can hardly be said to be requiring them to spend the day in devotional exercises. Neither did he bestow “special care upon the observance of the Lord’s day”-no, not any care whatever. Every reader knows that his edict of March 7, 321, had no reference to the Lord’s day, but to the venerable day of the

sun, which had long been known and venerated as the day of the sun by the pagans. If he did indeed say anything in behalf of the Lord's day, the reader may suppose that it was in his second edict-that which referred to the emancipation of slaves. Again I say, We shall see.*OGSO 46.1*

Of this decree I have a copy, together with an "interpretation," thereof, as found in the Justinian Code. I will give the "interpretation" first, as follows:-*OGSO 46.2*

"Interpretatio: Quamvis sancta die Dominica omnes lites ac repetitiones quiescere jusserimus, emancipare tamen ac manumittere minime prohibemus, et de his rebus gesta, confici pari ordinatione permittimus.*OGSO 46.3*

"(Cor. Theod., lib. II, Tit. VIII, de Feriis. Lex. I.-Baron. Annal., tome III, p 232.)"*OGSO 46.4*

"There!" exclaims the friend of Sunday; "now we have it from the most unquestionable historical data, that Constantine did indeed issue a decree in favor of the Lord's day by name; for this is his decree, coming to us through high authority. Here are the very words-*sancta die Dominica*, the Lord's holy day. This justifies all that Eusebius, Coleman, and the other numerous first-day writers, have said concerning Constantine."*OGSO 46.5*

And is it, then, so great cause of rejoicing that Constantine, who was professedly a pagan at that time, called the Sunday the Lord's day? One might think that they had found a divine warrant for so calling it. But let us look farther; perhaps the facts may cut off even this morsel of consolation. Fortunately for the truth of history, the original edict of Constantine has been preserved. In the work which now lies before me, immediately before the interpretation copied above, is the edict itself, as follows:-*OGSO 47.1*

"Imp. Constantinus Aug. Helpidio.*OGSO 47.2*

Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem Solis, venerationis suae celebrem, altercantibus jurglis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, eta gratum ac jocundum est, co die, quae sunt maxime votiva compleri: Atque ideo emancipandi et manumittendi die festo

cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur. PP. (I.) V. Non Junii Caralis, Crispo II. et Constantino II. Coss. (A Chr. 321.)"*OGSO 47.3*

And thus it is, that that which, in the interpretation, and in the writings of "Christian historians" almost without number, is the "sacred Dominical day," is, in the original, the very plain, old-fashioned, pagan *diem solis*! Not upon Baronius, nor the compiler of the Code, nor Justinian, nor altogether of the Dark Ages, does the responsibility of this deception rest most heavily; but upon those professed Protestants of this enlightened age, who perpetuate the deception, and leave the word of God, and take their rule of faith and practice from the words of heathen emperors and the man of sin, the son of perdition. I will notice one more like instance.*OGSO 47.4*

Morer was a writer of the Church of England. His book, "Dialogues on the Lord's Day," was written to vindicate their forms of church worship, especially the observance of Sunday. On page 257 he undertakes to show "the piety of all ages in this particular, and the care they had to have the Lord's day kept," by declaring "the Canons, Decrees, Edicts, and Laws," in behalf of the day. He proceeds thus:-*OGSO 48.1*

"I begin with the Emperor Constantine, who as soon as he had espoused the interest of Christianity, made it his particular business that his subjects should reverence this Festival, and so he issued out this decree: 'Let all Judges, Citizens, and Tradesmen rest upon the venerable Lord's day. But for such as live remote in the country,'" etc.*OGSO 48.2*

Perhaps the first edict of Constantine was not so well known in Morer's day as it is in "ours, and his mutilation would not attract much notice. Dishonest as it manifestly is, it is in perfect keeping with "the piety of all ages in this particular," for the Sunday-sabbath is a fraud at best; it has been constantly upheld by fraud; and nothing but fraud can give it even the appearance of an institution entitled to our respect.*OGSO 48.3*

The occasion is worthy of a little reflection. All history attests that Constantine was a devoted worshiper of Apollo, the sun-god.

Suppose that he had issued a decree directly in favor of the worship of Apollo, by that name, what would be thought of the historian who, suppressing the name of Apollo, should refer to this decree as evidence that Constantine commanded the worship of the Lord, the true God? One of two things we should have to conclude, namely, that the historian could not distinguish between Apollo and the true God, or else that he had perverted the facts to serve a purpose. But the advocates of Sunday have not scrupled to ascribe to Constantine the honor of bestowing "special care upon the observance of the Lord's day," when there is not in existence a word of evidence to justify the assertion; his only care was for the venerable day of the sun-a heathen festival day. Yet not a few Protestant ministers in America gravely assert that Constantine made a law forbidding the desecration of the Christian Sabbath! They treat his language as they do the words of Scripture. They affirm that John alluded to the first day of the week when he said, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," though they have never offered even a particle of proof that John, or anybody else in his day, thought of applying that title to the first day of the week.*OGSO 48.4*

But the mutilation of history and of the edict of Constantine is but a small matter, compared to what the author of Sunday worship has led its advocates to do in its behalf. From his heathen edict they have struck the venerable day of the sun, which, aside from its object, would be no offense at all, and inserted the Lord's day in its stead. From the infinitely higher edict, the law of Jehovah himself, they have struck out both the name of the Lawgiver, and the subject of the law. They have canceled the words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and substituted*OGSO 49.1*

4 a day which never was and cannot be the Sabbath-day of the Lord; a day upon which he did not rest from his work, which he never sanctified and blessed, and which he never commanded man to keep.*OGSO 49.2*

CONSTANTINE'S SECOND SUNDAY LAW

It is due to the reader that I give a translation of Constantine's second Sunday edict, and of the interpretation. Realizing that there are difficulties in these old Latin documents, I procured a translation from the professors of Basel University. I will give their translation as they gave it, in German:-*OGSO 50.1*

"Wie esals höchst unwürdig erscheint, den Tag der Sonne, an sich feierlich und ehrwürdig, zu Zankreden und leidigen Parteistreitigkeiten zu verwenden, so ist es lieb und werth, an diesem Tag das allerwünschenswertheste auszuführen. Deshalb soll allen gestattet sein, an diesen festlichen Tage frei und los zu lassen, und niemand soll an Verhandlungen darüber verhindert werden.*OGSO 50.2*

"*Auslegung*. Obgleich wir befohlen haben, dass am heiligen Herrntage alle Fragen um mein und dein und sonstige Rechtsforderungen ruhen sollen, verbieten wir doch keineswegs frei und los zu lassen und gestatten zugleich durch diese Verordnung die Verhandlugen hierüber in Ausführung zu brigen."*OGSO 50.3*

Following is its translation into English:-*OGSO 50.4*

"As it appears most unfitting to employ the day of the sun, in itself solemn and venerable, for controversies or noxious party strifes, so it is agreeable and fitting to carry out on this day that which is most of all desirable. Therefore all should be permitted on this festival day to set free and let loose slaves, and nobody should be hindered in transactions pertaining thereto.*OGSO 50.5*

"*Interpretation*: Although we have commanded that on the holy day of the Lord all questions concerning mine and thine, and all other law claims, should rest, we by no means forbid to set free and release slaves; and at the same time permit by this ordinance to carry out transactions pertaining thereto."*OGSO 51.1*

But it has been assumed with much confidence that the claim that the Papacy changed the Sabbath is unfounded, even admitting that there was no law for resting on Sunday before that of Constantine; for the Papacy did not exist until after that law was made, and

therefore the law antedated the Papacy.*OGSO 51.2*

As far as the Sunday-sabbath is concerned, this assumption does not help it at all, unless its friends would value it more highly from the hands of Paganism than from the Papacy. But the statement is open to two grave objections. It was Constantine himself who laid the foundation of the Papacy. Bower minutely details the order of the hierarchy, its divisions, and the orders of its officers, as established by Constantine, making it an ecclesiastical government closely modeled after the civil. Although the exarchs and metropolitan bishops were over all the bishops in their dioceses and provinces, there was no one bishop over all. Yet it was declared by the Council of Nicæa that the primacy should rest in the bishop of Rome, in honor of that city. The title was then an empty one, except in the honor of the name; but it became fruitful both of dignity and power. The bishop of Rome soon became the representative of the faith of the church. To be in harmony with Rome was to be orthodox; disagreement with Rome was heresy. But the bishop of Rome had to be governed by the councils. Constantine also made the bishop a civil magistrate, and allowed the church to obtain possessions of lands. Indeed, Stanley called the bishop of Rome "the chief Christian magistrate," and the emperor made his decisions as irreversible as if given by himself.*OGSO 51.3*

A certain writer well observed that Constantine would have proved himself a noble ruler if he had rested with the acts of toleration of Christianity; but he followed this up with acts of intolerance against all Christians but those who happened to enjoy his favor, who composed that party which could best serve the interests of the empire. This party, of course, was represented by the bishop of Rome; for it would have been absurd to think of best serving the empire by conferring the primacy on any bishop but that of the imperial city. It was Constantine who convened the Council of Nicæa, where the famous creed of the church was formed. Thus was laid the foundation of the Papacy, or Papal hierarchy.*OGSO 52.1*

CONSTANTINE DID NOT DISPLACE THE SABBATH

But the most decisive objection that I bring against the assumption herein noticed is, that Constantine did nothing whatever that can be construed into changing the Sabbath. This is important ground, upon which we are strongly fortified, as I propose to show. There is absolutely nothing to give the least color of plausibility to the assumption, except the words of Eusebius, wherein he says that "we" have transferred the duties of the Sabbath to the Lord's day. But he gives us no hint whereby we may judge to whom the "we" refers; nor does he produce a single act of anybody, which can possibly be construed into such a transfer. He speaks of Constantine's care for the Lord's day as evidence of his great interest in Christianity-a declaration in which there is not a particle of truth. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" justly says of Eusebius:-*OGSO 52.2*

"He was undoubtedly more of a courtier than was becoming in a Christian bishop, and in his 'Life of Constantine' has written an extravagant panegyric, rather than a biography of the emperor."*OGSO 53.1*

Considering the character of Constantine, the adulations of Eusebius are anything but pleasing to the Christian reader. Of the disposition of the bishops, who were intoxicated with the favors they received from the emperor, to flatter him, Neander (vol. 2, p.23) says:-*OGSO 53.2*

"One of them congratulated him as constituted by God as ruler over all in the present world, and destined to reign with the Son of God in the world to come."*OGSO 53.3*

When such flatterers state what Constantine did in behalf of Christianity, we must ask to have the distinct actions set forth, and then we must judge by the actions and not by the statements. Concerning the matter in question, the action is entirely wanting, and the statement is extravagant. The statement contains the first idea of the transfer of the duties of the Sabbath, but no evidence of the change.*OGSO 53.4*

Now we will consider what Constantine did, and the bearing of

those actions.*OGSO 53.5*

1. It is proved that the law of Constantine was the first law enforcing rest on the Sunday; and as Dr. Schaff says, it was done in accordance with his worship of Apollo, the sun-god.*OGSO 54.1*

2. It enforced rest on the judges, artisans, trades-people, etc., of the towns or cities. But it had no regard for classes-no relation at all to the professors of Christianity. It was in no sense a law of, or for, the church.*OGSO 54.2*

3. It did not restrain from labor in the country; and there, as in the cities, it had no regard for classes. In the towns it forbade all labor, whether by pagans or Christians. In the country it permitted all to labor, both pagans and Christians.*OGSO 54.3*

4. Constantine, in his decrees, said not one word either for or against keeping the Sabbath of the Bible. To this he did not refer in any way. Let not the reader suppose that he may have spoken concerning this in some other decree. I have now on my table a compilation of all the imperial and kingly decrees concerning the Sunday, compiled directly from the Codes, given in the originals. But two decrees of this nature are set down to Constantine, and these are both given in this article. The second was made in June, 321, as an explanation or modification of the first, the first being in March of the same year.*OGSO 54.4*

It is safe to affirm that there was nothing done in the time of Constantine, either by himself or any other, that has the least appearance of changing the Sabbath. It is said that he advised to have nothing in common with the Jews; perhaps he did, but it is certain that he did not refer in any way to the Sabbath in any law. It would have been well for the church and for Christianity if they had feared the Jews less, and refused to have anything in common with the pagans.*OGSO 54.5*

Constantine died a. d. 337. The date assigned to the Council of Laodicea is a. d. 364-27 years later. The canons of this council were accepted by the churches (*vide* McClintock & Strong), and have always been considered Catholic. This was a church assembly, an ecclesiastical congress. Did it do anything that

appeared like changing the Sabbath?-It did. It required Christians to rest on the Lord's day, meaning Sunday, and forbade their resting on the Sabbath, under penalty of being accursed from Christ-the severest penalty that they could pronounce. It peremptorily forbade the keeping of the Sabbath, and peremptorily required the keeping of the Sunday. If that council had had supreme power, and had avowed its intention to change the Sabbath, what could it have done more than it did in this canon? And if anyone yet denies that this was changing the Sabbath, will he please to frame a canon that would have had the effect to change the Sabbath-an improvement on this canon 29 of Laodicea? I would very much like to see someone make the attempt. Now, I claim that I have completely shown the time, the place, and the power that changed the Sabbath. And to make this matter sure, this voice of the Council of Laodicea has met a continual response from the Catholic Church in all ages, as it is easy to show. Charlemagne did more than any other emperor to make this part of the faith of the church effective, and in his first decree he referred directly to this canon of the Council of Laodicea.*OGSO 55.1*

Here I will notice that some capital has been made of the expression in this canon that they should rest on the Sunday as far as they were able, as if it were not peremptory. This is but a thoughtless cavil; for we must remember that there was a law of the empire that permitted labor in the country on Sunday, and over this law the council had no control. If Christians were, under service. in the country, to unbelieving masters, they could not rest from labor on the Sunday. The mandate was peremptory as far as the power of the church could reach.*OGSO 56.1*

In this manner the matter stood for several centuries. The law of Constantine was the law of rest for the empire, and the canon of Laodicea the Sabbath law, or law of rest, for the church, though the Sunday did not for many centuries bear the name of the Sabbath.*OGSO 56.2*

CATHOLIC CHURCH COUNCILS

It may be well to notice another objection here. It is this: "The Council of Laodicea was held in the Eastern church, and not in Rome; therefore the change was not by the Papal church."*OGSO 56.3*

If anything were needed to show that they who uphold the Sunday are reduced to great straits, their offering such objections as this would surely serve the purpose. It clearly proves that they take only superficial views of the evidences on the subject, and have never considered the real relation of events and localities. Notice a few points:-*OGSO 56.4*

1. The council that declared that the primacy should be in the bishop of Rome was also held in Asia Minor.*OGSO 56.5*

2. It was by the Emperor of the East that the bishop of Rome was constituted the head of all the churches and the corrector of heretics.*OGSO 57.1*

3. No *general* council was held west of Constantinople until the twelfth century. Does this fact have any effect on the supremacy of the Popes of Rome?*OGSO 57.2*

4. The decrees of councils received no authority from the places where they were held, but from the consent and action of the emperors, popes, and churches.*OGSO 57.3*

5. No council was ever convened that better served the purposes of the Pope than the second Council of Nicæa, Asia Minor, A. D. 787, called by Irene, "Empress of the East." Irene, crafty and unscrupulous, caused Tarasius, a layman, to be made bishop of Constantinople. Pope Hadrian, "offended at the uncanonical election and ordination of a layman, had declared that he approved of his election only upon condition that he got the holy images restored." So says Bower. But why did the Pope look to such a source for the accomplishment of such an object? It was because he knew that Charlemagne, then ruling in the West, was opposed to the worship of images, and so were nearly all the bishops of the West, and he knew that Irene was in favor of image worship. There

appeared to be no hope of their restoration, under the circumstances, except by means of a council called by the empress and patriarch of Constantinople. This council was attended by 375 bishops, all from the East, the West being represented only by the Pope's legates. There was great unanimity in their decision; but great also was the indignation manifested throughout the West. Charlemagne convened a council at Frankfort to counteract the decision of that of Nicæa, where its decree was condemned. The emperor made every effort to induce the Pope to condemn the Council of Nicæa, but in vain. The Pope declared that "apostolic traditions" were in favor of the adoration of images; and through his influence the decision of the second Council of Nicæa became the established faith of the church. Had the Pope united with Charlemagne and bishops of the West, the canon of Nicæa would have become a dead letter. The fact that the council was held in Asia Minor, and was called by the Empress of the East, does not destroy the claim that image worship is a Papal practice.*OGSO 57.4*

6. The Council of Laodicea was not ecumenical, but, as says the Cyclopedia of McClintock & Strong, its canons "were received by the other churches." The decisions of some of the most important councils, as that of Chalcedon and the second of Nicæa, were subjects of much contention. Probably the canons of no council met with greater favor than those of Laodicea; and amongst them the twenty-ninth was almost universally accepted, because the decree of Constantine had already popularized the day of the sun, and because the observance of the seventh day was stigmatized as a badge of Judaism. But it was specially received with favor in the West, the Church of Rome making the Sabbath a fast-day, which action was opposed by Constantinople. All history attests that Sunday received its strongest support from Rome, and that opposition to the Sabbath was much stronger in the West than in the East. The observance of the Sabbath continued longer in the East than in the West. As before said, the efficacy of the decisions of councils did not at all depend upon the places where they were held, but upon their being accepted and supported by the churches. As in the case of the second of Nicæa, so of that of Laodicea, Rome was the life and strength of its canons.*OGSO 58.1*

7. The words of historians have been herein quoted, which affirm that *it was not by any one act*, nor in a brief period of time, that the Sabbath was entirely supplanted by Sunday. That Rome, with all her influence, found it extremely difficult to exalt the Sunday to the place it attained, is proved by the many decrees of emperors and canons of councils which were found to be necessary to accomplish the object. Dr. Heylyn says the sixth Council of Constantinople, A. D. 690, did admonish those of Rome to forbear fasting on that day upon pain of censures. Rome had compelled fasting on the Sabbath for about three centuries before the time of that council, and she persisted and prevailed. The Sunday church festival, gradually turned into a Sunday-sabbath, is as truly a creature of the Papacy as is the custom of image worship.*OGSO 59.1*

8. All that part of the Protestant church at large which is represented in faith by the Baptists, has been forward to lay innovations to the charge of the Papacy. It has persistently declared that infant baptism is an institution of the Papacy. That it owes its strength and perpetuity-its general acceptance-to Rome, cannot be denied. And yet, who does not know that the practice originated in Africa, and not in Rome? So impossible is it for the advocates of Sunday to be consistent.*OGSO 59.2*

The sum of the matter is this: The primacy of Rome was declared in the East; the supremacy of Rome over all the churches was established in the East; all the general councils previous to the twelfth century were held in the East; all the churches, East and West, were united into one hierarchy by Constantine, and the actual division into Eastern and Western churches was not until the tenth century. Therefore, the councils held in the East were *councils of the Catholic Church* established by Constantine; they were councils of that church of which the bishop of Rome was primate, his primacy having been established in Asia Minor in A. D. 325.*OGSO 60.1*

This objection is only an evasion; a subterfuge, by which; if possible, to keep out of sight the fact that *the Sabbath was changed by the church in the fourth century*. Were the objection valid-were it a fact that the church represented by Rome had nothing to do in establishing this canon, it would not help the Sunday cause at all. It

would still remain a fact that the Sunday institution, as a day of church observance, received its authority, (1) from the twenty-ninth canon of the Council of Laodicea; and (2) from those who enforced and gave effect to that canon. It can be traced to no other source. But, unfortunately for the cause of the objectors, they cannot possibly separate this action from *the Catholic Church*, of which the bishop of Rome was primate.*OGSO 60.2*

I should feel like asking pardon of the reader for spending so much time on such a flimsy objection, were it not that it has been urged with most amazing confidence. The confident manner of the objector has more weight than the objection itself.*OGSO 60.3*

For the sake of brevity I will pass over the decrees from the time of Constantine to that of Leo the Great. They were all in effect similar to that of Constantine, taking notice of a few particulars as occasion seemed to require; but none of them made any, restriction on Sunday labor; they left it just where he left it. As for the church, everything was done that “Christian emperors,” kings, popes, councils, and synods, could do to uphold the canon of Laodicea, and add to the sanctity of the day of the sun. As to the canon itself, that could not be improved. It required them to “rest as Christians.” All that was added was to specify how Christians should spend the day.*OGSO 61.1*

DECREES OF THE LEOS

The letter of Pope Leo I. and the decree of Emperor Leo I. demand special notice because they have received so much attention from Christian writers.*OGSO 61.2*

And first of Pope Leo. Justin Edwards, in his so-called "Sabbath Manual" (p. 123), says:-*OGSO 61.3*

"Leo, bishop of Rome, in behalf of the church, about the year 440, said: 'We ordain, according to the true meaning of the Holy Ghost, and of the apostles as thereby directed, that on the sacred day, wherein our own integrity was restored, all do rest and cease from labor; that neither husbandmen nor other person on that day put their hands to forbidden works,' etc:"*OGSO 61.4*

Of this quotation I some time stood in doubt, for (1) I knew that Justin Edwards was not a careful writer; in this case he gave no reference to any authority, making himself responsible for the statement. (2) The opening words were scarcely such as would be used by a bishop in that age, even one as assuming as Leo was. (3) The bishop of Rome had no authority to forbid what the law of the empire permitted; for the law of Constantine, permitting husbandmen to labor, was still the law of the empire. Against these reasons I had no sufficient evidence that Leo I. was the author of these words. As Leo of Thrace came to the throne several years before Pope Leo died, it seemed reasonable that they had been confounded, and the words of Leo the Emperor had passed for those of Leo the Pope. And the probability seemed strengthened by the fact that Morer, probably following a mistake of Nicephorus, gives part of these words substantially to the Emperor Leo I., in his decree of a. d. 469.*OGSO 62.1*

But the difficulty was not thus solved, for on examining the decree of this emperor these words were not found there! [1]My quotations from edicts and canons, including the decrees of Constantine, are made from a publication bearing the following title:-

"Staats und Kirchen-Verordnungen über die christliche Sonntags-Feier, gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. Johann Konrad Ismischer, königl, zweiten Pfarrer an der Neustadtkirche zu Erlangen. I Abtheilung. Von Constant in dem

Grossen bis zum Trident iner, Concilium. Erlangen. 1839."
Although the title-page and preface are in German, the edicts are all given in the originals. Dr. Heylyn, more accurate than the others, has given the truth in the case. ("Hist. Sabbath," part 2, chap. 5, sec. 6.) They are in a decree of Leo, surnamed The Philosopher, who came to the throne of Constantinople in a. d. 886. Hessey (p. 89) gives a. d. 910 as the date of the decree of Leo the Philosopher. If this is the correct date, the words above quoted were given nearly five centuries later than the dates assigned to them by Justin Edwards! 2The following are the words of Hessey, p. 89: "In the East, the exemption granted to agricultural labors by Constantino, which had been embodied in the code of Justinian, was repealed by the Emperor Leo Philosophus, a. d. 910, who animadverted in somewhat severe terms on the law of his great predecessor." Hessey, I suppose, should be considered good authority, yet I incline to the opinion that this action of Leo the Philosopher was a few years earlier than he says. The difference, however, cannot be great enough to affect the argument. *OGSO 62.2*

At first glance it may be thought of not much importance to identify the source of these words. But it is; for thereby the fact is revealed that labor by husbandmen on Sunday was not forbidden in the fifth century, as they who assigned the words to the Leos of that century would have us believe. The decree of Leo the Philosopher, early in the tenth century, was the first authority suspending country labor on Sunday in the Eastern empire. He reversed that part of Constantine's decree because, as he said, "The fruits of the earth do not so much depend on the diligence and pains of the men, as on the efficacy of the sun, and the blessing of God." *OGSO 63.1*

Having cleared away this mist, we come to what the Leos of the fifth century really said. And first, Pope Leo the Great. This Pope did not, as might be supposed from references often made to him, give two several orders concerning the Sunday. Nor was the Sunday itself the subject of his celebrated letter. The subject was the conferring of holy orders; he decided that the time best adapted to this service was Sunday. He gave two reasons for this selection; the first is not noticed by those who quote him, though it is of equal interest with the other. And first, he says their minds were already solemnized by the fast of the Sabbath; he cited *Acts 13:3* to show that the apostolic practice was to set apart to sacred offices by

fasting and prayer; he required that, on such occasions, the usual Sabbath fast should continue until the evening or till the Sunday morning; that both the person to be ordained and those officiating might come to the service with sober minds. This is the first reason. The second is, that the Sunday itself is most fitting for such a service; and here follow the words that I have copied in the quotation from Coleman-only with this difference, that Coleman closes his quotation with the words, on this day "we ought to celebrate the solemnities of Christian worship," thus making it general, whereas the letter itself closes with reference, not to the solemnities of Christian worship in general, but to the solemn services of ordinations. I do not know what excuse Coleman would have to offer for making this change from Leo's words. But such things are not uncommon with Sunday historians.*OGSO 63.2*

It is interesting to notice that in this celebrated letter Leo twice uses the word "Sabbath," as the day of fasting, and calls the following day Sunday. He does not call it the Lord's day.*OGSO 64.1*

Dr. Schaff says: "The passage of Leo (Ep. IX, etc.), which Hessey has chosen as a motto for his work, is the most beautiful patristic expression concerning Sunday." It is a fact worthy of special notice, that the learned Hessey, in his "Bampton Lectures," preached before the University of Oxford, on "The Origin, History, and Obligation of the Lord's Day," took his motto from the letter of Pope Leo I. This is another proof-and they are not few-that it is not an idle boast of the Catholics that the Sunday festival is that institution by which the Protestants do homage to the Catholic Church. American Protestant authors are not slow to render the same homage, by quoting this letter as the best presentation of the reasons for keeping Sunday. But the reasons are all outside of any revelation given in the Scriptures-they are devised of the heart of man. How different is the case in regard to the Sabbath. Ask a Sabbath-keeper for the best presentation of the reasons for keeping the seventh day, and he will turn to the Bible-to the commandment spoken by Jehovah himself. It is "the holy of the Lord, honorable."*OGSO 64.2*

This letter of Pope Leo was dated a. d. 445. The edict of Emperor Leo was dated 469. In some respects it was the most important that

was given up to that time. But here I must digress to show the actual position of the emperors in relation to the church, lest their edicts be supposed to have a secular aspect merely.*OGSO 65.1*

Eusebius, in his “Life of Constantine,” Book IV, chap. 24, says that in his hearing the emperor thus addressed a company of bishops:-*OGSO 65.2*

“You are bishops whose jurisdiction is within the church; I also am a bishop ordained of God to overlook whatever is external to the church.”*OGSO 65.3*

Constantine considered-or at least affected to consider-himself ordained of God to order matters pertaining to the church, no less than the bishops themselves.*OGSO 65.4*

5 No doubt the flattery of such courtly bishops as Eusebius helped on the conceit. And it was for this reason that he called the Council of Nicæa, and took such a leading part in its deliberations, though personally he had never allied himself to Christianity. And this position he bequeathed to his successors-a position which the bishops were only too glad to accord to the emperors; for all the glory of the emperors, in this respect, tended to their own aggrandizement. It was greatly to their personal interest, and most of all to that of the bishop of Rome, to keep the church in close union with the State. But in order to this, it was necessary to recognize the right of the emperor to order matters in relation to the church. For many centuries no general or important council was called except by the emperor, or with his consent. No Pope could be ordained without his knowledge and consent. Hence, the custom of calling them “Christian emperors;” and their right to this title did not depend on their private characters, or their personal relation to Christianity.*OGSO 65.5*

The Emperor Leo I., who is called The Great, was not lacking in political sagacity, and thinking, no doubt, thereby to add to his dignity in the eyes of the people, he was crowned by the patriarch of Constantinople. This was the beginning of what proved to be one of the most dangerous prerogatives claimed by the church, a right claimed by, and accorded to, the bishop of Rome. Of course Leo was zealous for the advancement of the orthodox faith, and took

decided ground in favor of the Sunday. Some have inferred, and for it they have only inference, that the decree of Leo was wider in its scope than those which had preceded, because of the severity of the penalty which was attached. In this respect alone it is worthy of especial notice. His words were:-*OGSO 66.1*

“If any will presume to offend in the premises, if he be a military man, let him lose his commission; or if other, let his estate or goods be confiscated.”*OGSO 67.1*

He did not restrict that labor that was allowed by Constantine; and Heylyn proves by [original illegible] in the history of the times, that his decree largely referred to those things which should have been prohibited on every day of the week. And moreover his edict did not refer to the Sunday alone; for thus it ran:-*OGSO 67.2*

“It is our will and pleasure that the holy days dedicated to the highest Majesty, should not be spent in sensual recreations, or otherwise profaned by suits of law, especially the Lord’s day, which we decree to be a venerable day.”*OGSO 67.3*

Separating from the Pope and Emperor Leo of the fifth century all that has unjustly been assigned to them, we do not find in the letter of the one and the decree of the other, nearly as much as they are generally supposed to contain. Were it not that the letter of the Pope has been so freely used as the most beautiful expression in behalf of Sunday, and offered as the best presentation of the reasons for keeping that day, there would be nothing of special interest in it.*OGSO 67.4*

LETTER OF POPE LEO THE GREAT

Having written thus much, and considering that the matter of Led the Great has been so greatly misunderstood, I think I could not do a better service to the reader in this connection, than to give him the benefit of a translation of this letter of Pope Leo. It is from an authorized and commended edition of the letters of the Popes, in German. It is No. IX of Leo's letters, and is in two chapters; but the second chapter relates altogether to the mass, and that is of no interest in this discussion. It is as follows:-*OGSO 67.5*

"Leo, the Bishop, sends to Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, Greeting:*OGSO 68.1*

"What great love in the Lord we cherish for your love, you can gather from this, that we wish to establish more firmly the beginning of your office, in order that nothing may be wanting to the perfection of your love, since, as we became convinced, the merits of spiritual grace attend you. The fatherly and brotherly conferring (of the office) must accordingly be most desirable to your holiness, and be so received by you as you see it proceed from us. For we must be *one* in thought and action, in order to verify what we read, (to wit,) that we have *one* heart and *one* soul. 'For inasmuch as Peter received from the Lord the apostolic primacy, and since the Roman Church adheres to the institutions of this apostle, it is not to be supposed that his holy disciple Mark, who was the first to lead the Alexandrian church, shaped his institutions in accordance with other rules, for undoubtedly did the spirit of the disciple and that of the master both draw from *one* and the same fount of grace, and the ordained could teach nothing else but what he received from him who ordained him.' [27] Decret. cf. C. XXIV. qu. I, c. 16. We do not therefore suffer that we, who indeed profess the same faith in *one* body, should differ in anything from one another, nor that the institutions of the disciples should be distinguished from those of the teacher.*OGSO 68.2*

"I Chapter. *On which day the consecration of priests and Levites is to be held*.*OGSO 68.3*

"That which therefore, as we know, has been observed by our

fathers with a devoted care, we wish to know to be likewise cherished by you, namely, that the consecration of priests and Levites be not undertaken on any day indiscriminately, but that [for this purpose] after the Sabbath-day the beginning of that night be chosen in which the morning of the first day of the week begins to dawn, [1]Translator's note to the German edition: "Ejus noctis quae in prima Sabbati lucesit, in which sentence Sabbatum equals week, consequently 'the first day of the week,' corresponding to our Sunday." when the ones to be consecrated, fasting, will receive the holy consecration by those who [themselves have] fasted. But the rule will even then be observed, when the consecration will be given, under a continuation of the fasting of Saturday, on Sunday morning, from which time the beginning of the preceding night is not distant, which no doubt, as becomes evident from the Passah of the Lord, belongs to the day of the resurrection. [28] Decret. of. D. LXXV. c. 4. For besides the authority of custom, which evidently springs from the teachings of the apostles, the Holy Scriptures also state very plainly, that the apostles, at the time they sent Paul and Barnabas by command of the Holy Spirit to proclaim the gospel among the heathen, laid their hands upon them by fasting and prayer, in order that we might know with what devotion the one giving and the one receiving it must take care lest a sacrament so rich in blessing should appear to be performed thoughtlessly. For this reason you will observe the apostolic institutions in a devout and commendable way, when you observe this rule in the ordination of priests, in the churches over which the Lord has made you overseer, namely, that the one to be ordained receives the consecration solely and only on the day of the resurrection of the Lord, which, as you know, begins from the evening of the Sabbath, and is made sacred by so many divine mysteries, that whatever of greater prominence was commanded by the Lord, took place on this exalted day. On this day the world had its beginning; on it, through the resurrection of Christ, death found its end, and life its beginning; [39] Decret. of. D. LXXV. c. 5. on it the apostles received their commission from the Lord to proclaim the gospel to all nations, and to dispense to the entire world the sacrament of the regeneration. On it, as the holy evangelist John testifies, the Lord, after he had joined the assembled disciples by closed doors, breathed upon them and said: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and

whosesoever sins, ye retain, they are retained.' On this day, finally, came the Holy Spirit, which the Lord had promised the apostles, in order that we might recognize, as it were, inculcated and taught by a heavenly rule, that we are to undertake on that day the mysteries of the priestly consecration, on which all gifts and graces were imparted."*OGSO 68.4*

How much has been drawn from this letter that is not justified by its words, the reader can judge for himself. Though it is made almost the gospel of Protestant Sunday-keeping, it certainly was not written to prove that it is a day of general observance.*OGSO 70.1*

I have already noticed that there was no specific law in the Eastern empire against Sunday labor in the country, until the decree of Leo VI., called The Philosopher, early in the tenth century. I do not speak of the effect that may have resulted from the general enforcement of the Catholic faith, but only of Sunday law. In the West this work began with the third Council of Orleans, A. D. 538; and it is an interesting fact that this council, which was first to give a decision in favor of refraining from labor in the country on Sunday, gave as the reason, that the people might attend the services of church, and also proceeded to mitigate the rigors of the observance of the day, which many have superstitiously thrown over it. It was not in the province of this council to try to control the use of the day further than to advise to abstain from work during the time of public worship. But from this time forward there was a greater restraint placed upon Sunday labor, and the severity of the penalties was greatly increased. The emperors and kings, being the guardians and actual heads of the churches, were often most forward to advance the Sunday cause, granting even more than the church dignitaries had asked in the way of legal exactions; but there was little modesty on either side in this respect, for the history of the enforcement of Sunday and of opposition to the Sabbath, is one of remorseless cruelty, from the very time when the Council of Laodicea showed the true spirit of the Papacy in its curse upon Sabbath-keepers.*OGSO 70.2*

And it was not Sunday alone that was thus cared for; "other festivals of the saints" were enforced with no less rigor than was Sunday, and they were justly classed together in imperial and

church action. And they were so classed together by the reformers. Coleman gives the following testimony to their faith in this respect:-*OGSO 71.1*

“The Augsburg Confession classes the Lord’s day under the same category as Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like; merely human ordinances.”-*Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. 1, p. 538*.*OGSO 71.2*

The reformers were deeply versed in the history and literature of the church, and were well qualified to judge whether the Sunday Lord’s day was an institution of the Papacy. Speaking of the Puritan idea of a Christian Sabbath, Coleman further says:-*OGSO 71.3*

“The law of the Sabbath was indeed a religious principle, after which the Christian church had, for centuries, been darkly groping. Pious men of every age had felt the necessity for divine authority for sanctifying the day.-*Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p.533*.”*OGSO 71.4*

Yes, and as far as any divine authority for sanctifying the Sunday is concerned, the necessity is no less deeply felt at the present time. This is manifested by the straits into which they are brought to defend the day; the contradictions which abound in the arguments of its advocates; the frauds by which it has been popularized, which are indorsed even in this enlightened age. This is a most striking confession from Coleman. It is strange indeed that the piety and erudition of almost fifteen centuries, from the time of the apostles to the rise of the Puritans, had not succeeded in discovering the law of the Sunday-sabbath, if such a law existed by divine authority!*OGSO 72.1*

CATHOLIC FRAUDS FOR SUNDAY

The Papacy is always best prepared to meet such emergencies, and this was met in its own peculiar way. In the year 1201 was produced the law, in the form of a letter sent down from Heaven. Absurd as was this pretense, and ridiculous as was the law itself, it had more to do with establishing Sunday-keeping on a permanent basis in England and Scotland than any other cause. And Protestant churches are eating the fruit of this shameful deception at the present time.*OGSO 72.2*

This law did not stand alone. Miracles, such as the Papal Church always has on hand for times of need, were freely produced, in the line of terrible calamities which befell those who neglected to obey this letter, in not keeping Sunday and the other festivals of the church. But the want of truly divine, of scriptural, authority for keeping the Sunday-sabbath still remains.*OGSO 72.3*

From this flood of falsehood and wickedness of worldly power, we turn, as has been said, with just satisfaction to the record of the Sabbath of the Lord, and to the means of its proclamation. Its history is untainted by deception, unstained by crime. No contradictions, no subterfuges, are found in its advocates. Resting upon the broad and solid basis of the commandment of God, it needs no emperors, no Popes, no councils to add to its dignity, its sacredness, or its authority.*OGSO 73.1*

Although I have noticed but a small part of the edicts, canons, exactions, and especially of the penalties, with which the history of Sunday abounds, I have done all that is necessary to meet my present purpose. I did not propose to give an extended view of these matters; it is enough that I have furnished the most incontestible proof that the Catholic Church, and it alone, changed the Sabbath. And I will repeat what I affirmed, that of all the unscriptural institutions foisted upon the church, none is so distinctively Papal as the Sunday-sabbath,-the preceptive rest of the so-called Lord's day. No other institution of human origin can so clearly be traced to the Papal power. If anyone doubts this statement I shall be pleased to see a comparison of evidences instituted. If this were not the case-if other traditional precepts could

be more clearly traced to that source-that would not invalidate a single point of my argument. Whatever may be said of other innovations, our position stands strong; our proof is clear and well defined. The question, Who changed the Sabbath? is sufficiently answered.*OGSO 73.2*

And now I appeal to the reader; of all the proofs presented, how much have I relied upon the Catholic catechism? Who that reads the mere culling of proofs that I have furnished, can give any credit to the statement that Sabbatarians, in searching two hundred years, have not been able to find an item of reliable history to prove their position-that their sole reliance is the Catholic catechisms? I truly pity the man who has had the ability and opportunity to read, who can find it in his heart to make such a reckless statement.*OGSO 74.1*

It will be noticed that the writer from whom we quoted in the beginning entirely concealed from his readers the arguments and evidences which have been presented by the advocates of the Sabbath. And I ask him to give me the credit of following his example. All the testimonies that I have presented, all the decrees or canons of councils, all the edicts of emperors, all historical statements, are from the pens of those who were not favorable to the Sabbath. And while I have given but a small part of the evidence of this kind, what an array is presented! How can the friends of Sunday withstand the facts and the evident conclusion?*OGSO 74.2*

SYLVESTER, CONSTANTINE, AND THE LORD'S DAY

It is not because of any real connection between these names and this title that they are here placed together, but because of certain associations that have been ascribed to them, to examine which is the purpose of this chapter.*OGSO 75.1*

In a recently written article on the change of the Sabbath I made this remark: "Sylvester was bishop of Rome during most of the reign of Constantine. He decreed that Sunday should be called the Lord's day." In this I rested upon the testimony of the "Magdeburg Centuries," as will be found quoted in the "History of the Sabbath," by Elder J. N. Andrews, page 351. Not long after the publication of the article above-mentioned, I received a letter from Dr. A.H. Lewis, of New Jersey, inquiring if I could verify this statement, or whether it was a historical myth, so many of which have come down to us from the early centuries. As soon as possible I commenced the investigation of this subject, taking in, also, the statement of Nicephorus, that Constantine directed that it should be so called. See "History of the Sabbath," page 352 (third edition, 1887).*OGSO 75.2*

I would here call attention to two facts: (1) The quotations and references made by Elder Andrews, in his "History of the Sabbath," are *absolutely correct*. The closest criticism has never been able to impeach that book in a single particular. They only have found fault with it whose knowledge did not entitle them to the position of critics. (2) The "Magdeburg Centuries" is the work of an association of learned and impartial men, thoroughly conversant with ecclesiastical history. And so, if there is any question of the correctness of the assertion concerning Sylvester, it does not fall upon the author of the "History of the Sabbath," nor yet upon the authors of the "Magdeburg Centuries," but upon the earlier historians from whom those authors drew their information. And again, if it should be proved that the information was not correct, that fact will not at all militate against the position of the author of the "History of the Sabbath." To the contrary, it will rebound against those who originated the statement, in order to give the authority of the name of a highly-honored bishop, absolutely the first Pope, in favor of the title of Lord's day being given to the first day of the

week, familiarly known as the day of the sun. It would but prove that there was *no authority* of any nature in the first half of the fourth century for giving the Sunday the title of the Lord's day.*OGSO 75.3*

Of the real history of Sylvester but little is known. This, at first thought, seems very strange, considering that he lived at a most interesting period in the history of the Catholic Church, namely, at the time when its foundation was laid; that he was bishop most of the time that Constantine was emperor; and that in the time of his bishopric the primacy of the See of Rome was established, which finally led to the complete exaltation of the "Sovereign Pontiff." There can be no doubt that the following remarks by De Cormenin, in his "History of the Popes," are strictly correct:-*OGSO 76.1*

"The actions of this pontiff remain in oblivion; and the legends transmitted by the monks, since the fifth century, are less adapted to put us in possession of the truth than to convince us that the history of a man so celebrated has been corrupted nearly up to its very source. We would not adopt the fictions of authors, who represent Sylvester as the catechist of Constantine, and pretend that this prince was cured of leprosy, and baptized by the pontiff. They add, that the emperor, in gratitude, made him a donation of the city of Rome, and ordered all the bishops of the world to be submissive to the pontifical See. They affirm that the Council of Nice assembled by the orders of Sylvester, and that he first granted the right of asylum to churches.*OGSO 76.2*

"Romuala and some undiscerning compilers give us all these ridiculous fables as facts of which celebrated historians have proved the falsity."-*Page57, edition 1846, Campbell, Philadelphia, from the French*.*OGSO 77.1*

It is beyond all question that interested parties were guilty of the most shameful frauds, to give the authority of the name of Sylvester to traditions and practices which they wished to fasten upon the church. Just as soon as the full authority of emperors, councils, and bishops was acknowledged over the church, just so soon the authority of the Scriptures began to wane. And when the priests and monks were honored as the expounders of the will of Heaven; when their word was accepted by the Christians as sufficient authority,

they introduced countless “pious frauds,” to impose upon the credulous people, to strengthen and confirm their own authority. This was all made to turn to the honor of the Roman pontiff; and to convince the people that such was the opinion, the decision of a celebrated Pope was enough to insure its general and unqualified acceptance.*OGSO 77.2*

On this account it has been a most difficult task for the critic and the historian to give reliable information to the world, it being so difficult to separate the genuine from the counterfeit. And in very many cases the genuine has been so corrupted by designing men that it remains a matter of great uncertainty what was actually said and done. This is shown in the reputed letters of “the Fathers,” which have been multiplied beyond measure, and their genuine letters have been so tampered with that they are often of little service in giving the actual opinions of their authors. What they really wrote must always remain, to a great extent, uncertain.*OGSO 77.3*

In this respect the memory of Sylvester has been peculiarly unfortunate. There is an abundance of tradition respecting him, so much that the truth has been almost entirely neglected, or purposely hid. Certain it is that his life was an eventful one, and his writings not numerous, or else the tradition makers have done him great injustice, to serve their fraudulent purposes.*OGSO 78.1*

And it should be borne in mind that these deceptions were not harmless. Nor does an exposure of their falsity in the least lessen the wrong they have done to the world and to the cause of Christianity. What matters it that they are exposed as vile frauds and forgeries? their authors and perpetuators have no further need of them. They served their purposes, and they can now be spared; but their influence is as enduring as if they were inspired and eternal truth. The words of the bishop were as the word of God to the people, to whom the real word of God was becoming unknown. The deception, the tradition, was given to establish a desired custom; and the custom in time became the warrant for its own observance as a Christian duty. In this manner professed Protestants, even to this day, suffer themselves to be imposed upon. Leaving the Scriptures of truth, they inquire what was the custom of the church in the early centuries; but they do not carefully

inquire how those customs became established. If they would do this, they would find in a large proportion of cases that the customs they so willingly follow became customs by means of the vilest frauds.*OGSO 78.2*

In regard to what is ascribed to Sylvester in ordering that the day of the sun should be called the Lord's day, it will be seen by the quotation from the "Magdeburg Centuries" that these authors give *Metaphrastes* as their authority for the statement. And as no other authority is referred to, and the statement is found nowhere else, it rests entirely on the reliability of this writer. Four times in their brief history of Sylvester, they quote, or refer to, Metaphrastes. I say, their brief history, for the whole biography of Sylvester is given in less than one actual page. The edition of Lucius, Basel, 1624, that which Elder Andrews examined in the Library of Andover Theological Seminary, is in large pages, double columns, each column being counted for a page; so that pages 739 and 740 are on the same side of the same leaf. About two-thirds of this complete page is devoted to Sylvester.*OGSO 79.1*

We must now turn our attention to Metaphrastes, and inquire how he stands as a historian, whether his writings are so worthy of credit that we may safely and surely depend on his assertions in such a matter as the one under consideration. In regard to this, it does not appear to be difficult to arrive at a conclusion, for the testimony concerning him is all on one side-all to the same intent. "McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia" says:-*OGSO 79.2*

"Very little is known of his individual history. The name Metaphrastes was given him on account of the manner in which he commented and paraphrased (*åìåôåöñáóå*) the materials for his biographical work. The greatest variety of opinion prevails as to the time when he lived. Blondell, Vossius, Ceillier, Baronius, Simler, Valaterra, Allatius, Cave, Oudin, Fabricus, all give different dates, varying from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries. It even appears uncertain whether there may not have existed two men of that name at different times.... The work is not original. Metaphrastes only arranged and paraphrased, in very good style for the times, various biographies which existed previously in the libraries of churches and convents. He omitted many details which he

considered useless or unproved, and substituted others which he considered more important or authentic. He has been accused of having by these modifications destroyed the simplicity of the ancient biographies. His own work has undergone many alterations and additions, as well as curtailment, so that, according to Fabricus, out of 539 biographies generally ascribed to him, 122 are undoubtedly genuine."*OGSO 80.1*

This certainly does not afford any assurance that we may rest with confidence upon the statements of those writings which pass under the name of Metaphrastes. But let us inquire further. Herzog, "Rel. Encyclopedia," says:-*OGSO 80.2*

"This Byzantine author has established for himself a name in the literature of the middle ages, by collecting and working over older and more recent histories of martyrs and saints. But just as his collection itself is composed of the most unlikely elements, and contains that which is most spurious and fabulous, so there is attached to him and to his age a considerable darkness; he belongs to those of whom one does not like to be reminded, because they are surrounded by nothing but confusion and uncertainty."*OGSO 80.3*

A work entitled, "Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History," by John Goulter Dowling, M. A., Wadham College, Oxford (London, Rivington, 1838), speaks thus of our author:-*OGSO 81.1*

"In the early part of the tenth century, Simeon Metaphrastes was employed by the emperor to rewrite, in a popular and attractive manner, the lives of the saints and martyrs. He executed his commission by compiling from the ancient narratives a number of labored and ostentatious panegyrics, contemptible for their false taste, and noxious for the fabulous circumstances and superstitious opinions which he has interwoven with the original materials. His ill-employed labor inflicted on church history is a deep and lasting injury; for the compositions, which were written in accordance with the feelings and notions of the day, soon superseded the less obtrusive works, which possessed a really historic value. The greater part of the lives of the Eastern saints, which have come down to us, have, unfortunately, passed through the hands of

Simeon or his imitators; and it is now too often the chief business of the ecclesiastical critic to distinguish between the evidence of the ancient biographers and the fables of the metaphrast."-*Pp. 84, 85.*OGSO 81.2

It does not seem to be necessary to multiply evidences on this point. These authorities, themselves reliable, speak so decisively on the subject, that I think all will agree that we do well to require some more and better evidence than that of Metaphrastes before we accept as truth any reputed historical statement.OGSO 81.3

It will be readily conceded-that there is nothing incongruous in the idea of Sylvester ordering that Sunday should be called the Lord's day; so that it could be accepted if there were any reliable evidence to that effect. But we may safely say there is not. It does not become us to admit that it did take place, merely because it would not be an incredible circumstance if proof thereof existed. We can only safely admit as a fact of history that of which some reliable proof can be offered.OGSO 82.1

There is another circumstance which tells against the statement. If Sylvester had, by his assumed apostolic authority, ordered that Sunday should thenceforth be called the Lord's day, that order would have been honored by succeeding bishops, and especially by the bishops or popes of Rome, who were ever on the alert to do honor to that See. But such was not the case. Leo. I., surnamed the Great, was as assuming as need be, and he made most strenuous efforts to exalt the honor and authority of the See of Rome over all the churches. This was less than a century before Justinian subjected all the churches to Rome. If his predecessors in that chair, in the time of Constantine, had decreed that Sunday should be called the Lord's day, it would certainly seem incredible that Leo I., in his celebrated letter, to which reference is so often made, as being the most beautiful expression of the reasons for keeping that day, should call it the day of the sun, and not the Lord's day. In that letter he twice referred to the first day, and twice to the seventh day. The latter he called once Saturday and once the Sabbath. The former he once called the first day of the week, and once Sunday; but not at all the Lord's day.OGSO 82.2

Rejecting the testimony of Metaphrastes as apocryphal, as that upon which we can place no reliance, and considering that the succeeding bishops failed to recognize such an order in their actions and letters, I cannot consider the assertion that Sylvester ordered that Sunday be call the Lord's day, entitled to any credit whatever.*OGSO 83.1*

What about the statement of Nicephorus, that Constantine also ordered that the day of the sun should be called the Lord's day? I am free to say that I never attached much importance to this statement, even before I had instituted any examination of the claims of Nicephorus to be considered a reliable historian. I had studied the life and character of Constantine sufficiently to cause me to doubt the correctness of the statement, let it come from whom it might. All the evidence goes to show that Constantine was never a devoted worshiper of the Lord; that he held Apollo, the sun-god, in reverence during his whole life. His edict in behalf of the venerable day of the sun was in honor of Apollo, as the highest Christian authorities testify. To the time of his death he held the office of high priest of the pagan rites. His veneration for Sunday was in regard to its dedication to the worship of the sun, and that only. There is absolutely nothing in the history of Constantine to justify the belief that the statement quoted by Nicephorus is true.*OGSO 83.2*

It was Nicephorus who first ascribed the words of Leo the Philosopher, in which he reversed the law of Constantine in regard to Sunday labor, to Leo I., of Thrace. These were the words that Justin Edwards gave to Pope Leo the Great. I say Nicephorus was first to make this statement, because he is the first authority for that statement of whom I have any knowledge. I have no knowledge that anyone made the statement again until several centuries after his time. This mistake in regard to the decrees of the Leos is inexcusable in Nicephorus, because he had the means at hand to verify his assertions, namely, the Code of Justinian, in which the decree of Leo I. was to be found.*OGSO 83.3*

In this I am taking for granted that Nicephorus did make the statement. Elliott (Horæ Apocalypticæ) quotes a Doctor Maitland who says that Nicephorus said so; but as no reference is given to

book, chapter, or page, I have been unable to verify it. I examined Nicephorus by the table of contents under every word where I thought possible to find it, as Constantine, Sylvester, Dominicum, Diem, etc., but could not find it. I also examined considerable that he wrote about Constantine, but did not find the remark in question. I accept, however, the assertion that Nicephorus did say so, and proceed to inquire as to the probability of its correctness.*OGSO 84.1*

First, we must guard against confounding this Nicephorus with Nicephorus patriarch of Constantinople about the beginning of the ninth century. He also wrote a brief church history, embracing only the period from A. D. 602, the time of the death of Maurice, to A. D. 769. Calistus Nicephorus is supposed to have lived about the beginning of the fourteenth century, but the actual time is unknown. The “Encyclopedia Britannica” says:-*OGSO 84.2*

“For the first four centuries the author is largely dependent upon his predecessors, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius, his additions showing very little critical faculty; in the later period, his labors, based on documents now no longer extant, to which he had free access, though he used them also, with small discrimination, are much more valuable.”*OGSO 85.1*

Inasmuch as the works to which he had access are not now extant, and he used them without discrimination, as others also testify, how are we to determine that his later writings are much more valuable? Of this we can better judge when we more fully understand his character as a writer. The above quotation says he depended upon preceding historians for the events of the first four centuries. But I think it is not difficult to show that he drew as largely from the imagination and from monkish legends as from the historians named. Certainly he did not draw the statement in question from either of these. It was derived from some other source; and what? who can tell?*OGSO 85.2*

The “Real Encyclopedia” of Herzog says:-*OGSO 85.3*

“Nicephorus has, as is well known, made no great name for himself by his church history. Good language and dextrous representation have won for him the name of an ecclesiastical Thucydides, during

the time when a collection of fables and impossibilities stood just as high" (as a church history).*OGSO 85.4*

It goes on to say that Nicephorus spoke slightingly of his predecessors, and promised to improve on them by strict adherence to truth; but that the expectation raised by these promises was not at all met by the work itself. The work of Dowling, already referred to, "Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History," says:-*OGSO 85.5*

"Though he amply partook of the superstition of the age in which he lived, and paraphrased the writers from whom he derived his information in the affected and extravagant style characteristic of the later Greeks, he has transmitted some important facts of which we should without him have remained in ignorance. He was eloquent, diligent, and inquisitive, though destitute of judgment and discrimination."-*Pp. 92, 93.OGSO 86.1*

And still the query will arise, How are we to know that they are facts, seeing that no writer but himself has left them on record, and seeing that he was destitute of judgment and discrimination, and dealt largely in fables and legends? The Cyclopedia of McClintock and Strong speaks thus of him:-*OGSO 86.2*

"The last of the Greek Church historians, and the only one their church produced in the middle ages. He is frequently denominated the ecclesiastical Thucydides, because of the elegance of his style, and the theological Pliny, because of the superstition and credulity which are betrayed in his writings.... His work is of great interest, as it is the only contribution to church history which appeared in the East, from the sixth to the fourteenth century. It is, however, generally condemned in modern times as a compilation of fables and absurdities."*OGSO 86.3*

The authors of the "Magdeburg Centuries" have shown their appreciation of Nicephorus in the following manner. Speaking of the wonderful things ascribed to Sylvester, such as the baptism of Constantine for the cure of his leprosy, for which the emperor donated to him the city of Rome with lands surrounding, they add: "We will mention nothing here of the wonderful conversion of the Jews, by means of a bullock, to be sure; the restoration to life of

one killed by a Jewish sleight-of-hand performer; we wish that boasting style of narration to be sought by those who delight in it, in Nicephorus."-*P. 139*.*OGSO 86.4*

The reader can hardly fail to be interested in the following as a specimen of *history*. It is from the account by Nicephorus of the baptism of Constantine, the healing of his leprosy, the donation, etc., etc., all of which is to the glory of the Roman bishop:-*OGSO 87.1*

"For in this very night, in the enjoyment of his rest, he received a vision, for Peter and Paul, the chief of the apostles, appeared to him and said: O Constantine, we are Peter and Paul, sent to you by the Lord God, that we exhibit to you a sign and indication of healing. They exhorted him that he should inquire for Sylvester, the head of the saints of that city, with whom is a fish-pond, in which if he should bathe, very soon all his disease should cease; and from that grace he should have children innocent and free from the corruption of that disease.*OGSO 87.2*

"When sleep left him he called for his physician, who for a long time had stood a long way off, and told him he had no longer need of human help, for help had come by a most high hand. Then when he came to Sylvester he told him that he wished him to consider with reverence and veneration, that the gods, under the name of Peter and Paul, had visited him. And Sylvester said, O emperor, there are not many gods, but one, and Peter and Paul are not gods, but indeed servants and apostles of God, who, because of their faith and devotion, had been in great favor, holding the first place among the saints."-*Book 7*, *chap. 33, p. 286, edition Basel, 1553*.*OGSO 87.3*

He then proceeds to recount at length those things which all know to be only fables. According to this, Constantine was baptized at the time of his first knowledge of the Christian religion; whereas, it is well known that he was baptized in Nicomedia, near the very close of his life. To the chronicler of these fables and legends of the Dark Ages, we are indebted for the statement that Constantine ordered that Sunday should be called the Lord's day.*OGSO 87.4*

These stories, told by Metaphrastes and Nicephorus, served an

excellent purpose to give honor to the day of the sun, when the words of Sylvester and Constantine had such weight among the benighted and credulous church people. And were it possible to separate the truth from fables in the whole field of church history, who can tell how many statements, now passing for historical truth, would be shown to be fabulous and fraudulent? And yet professed Protestants, of this age of light and Bible privileges, too often leave the word of God, and find their duty in following the customs and traditions of those ages of darkness and mysticism! How necessary at this time to listen to the word of inspiration: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20*.*OGSO 88.1*

The word is a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path. *Psalm 119:105*. It is sufficient for our every need, for it is given that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. *2 Timothy 3:17*. He who adds to it or takes from it, does so at the risk of eternal life. *Revelation 22:18, 19*.*OGSO 88.2*

Now in regard to this, we may conclude as we did in the case of Sylvester. Seeing that "Christian princes" were fully agreed with councils and popes to do honor to this day, we can but think that if Constantine had made an order that the title of the venerable day of the sun should be exchanged for that of the Lord's day, his successors in the throne of the empire would have paid some respect to, or taken some notice of, that order. Some of them would. doubtless have given the day that title in their edicts. But they did not. This fact is well stated by Doctor Heylyn, thus:-*OGSO 88.3*

"So for the after ages, in the edicts of Constantine, Valentinian, Valens, Gratian, Honorius, Arcadius, Theodosius, Christian princes all, it hath no other name than Sunday, or *dies solis*; and many fair years after them, the synod held at Dingulosium, in the lower Bavaria, Anno 772, calls it plainly Sunday."-*History of the Sabbath, Part 2, chap. 2, sec. 12*.*OGSO 89.1*

Here I leave the whole subject with the reader, believing that all who want *proof* for the basis of their belief, will reject as spurious both the statement of Metaphrastes and that of Nicephorus, in

regard to orders by Sylvester and Constantine requiring that Sunday be called the Lord's day. Probably no such orders were ever given by any authority in either Church or State. The practice of calling it so grew up gradually, and it was never recognized as being *by any authority* either divine or human. Had there ever been any recognition of such authority, there would have been more uniformity in the practice. But, for many centuries, the edicts of emperors and kings uniformly called it the day of the sun; while councils called it indifferently both Sunday and Lord's day. The title Sunday, however, would be more correctly written *Sun's day*, as this agrees with the Latin from which it is rendered.*OGSO 89.2*

CANDID SUNDAY HISTORY

I will draw the subject to a close by giving a summary of the historical points compiled from a recently-written history:-*OGSO 90.1*

"The Sunday is not mentioned by this name in the Old Testament, neither has the day under name of the first day of the week in that book received any prominent place; and it was not appointed a rest-day at all through any law before the year a. d. 321. The old name of the day, which was afterward christened, is the day of the sun; yet this name does not originate from the creation of the sun, since the sun was made on the fourth day of creation.*OGSO 90.2*

"At the dawn of creation it introduces the week, but the account does not give it any higher rank than the other days.... Our Sunday meets us from the very beginning as a common day. With the last day of the week, the seventh, it is somewhat different. Of this it is said with emphasis: 'And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.'*OGSO 90.3*

"The day of our Lord's resurrection is indeed a commemorative day, which will never be forgotten or passed by in his church; but from this-as one may think-it does not follow that we should give up the Sabbath, which God himself has ordained, and plainly pointed out at creation, nor that we should move it unto any other day of the week, because that day is a commemorative day. To do this we need just as plain a commandment of God declaring that the first day [that is, the original Sabbath] is repealed. But where do we find such a commandment? It is true that no such a commandment is found.*OGSO 90.4*

"In the laws of the State we afterward find the prohibition against Sunday work further and further extended, and the people threatened with more and more punishment if they disregard it. Besides the giving of laws, we also find a new theological doctrine concerning Sunday: that Sunday-keeping is founded on the

Sabbath-keeping which God ordained through Moses. Yet this doctrine does not seem through all the sixth century to have become a definite dogma in the church.*OGSO 90.5*

“If we try now to collect that which may be learned from history concerning Sunday and the development of Sunday-keeping, then the sum is this: Neither the apostles nor the first Christians nor the ancient councils have marked the Sunday with the name and mark of the Sabbath, but the church and scholastic doctors of the Middle Ages have done this.*OGSO 91.1*

“1. That Sunday is not the Sabbath of the Old Testament, and that this is not the common belief in the Christian church; but it is rather a mistaken idea, that the Sabbath should be changed from the seventh to the first day of the week.*OGSO 91.2*

“2. That keeping Sunday with rest from labor and divine worship, has not by the most renowned ancient Fathers been founded on the Sabbath of the Old Testament, neither reference to the Sabbath of the Old Testament entered into the confession of the church before the sixth century after Christ.*OGSO 91.3*

“3. That this doctrine first arose in the Papal Church,-that Sunday-keeping is commanded in the third commandment, and that the essential and prominent part of this commandment is a decree from God, to wit, to keep a holy day once a week.”*OGSO 91.4*

Some may question the correctness of the statement here made, that the doctrine that the fourth commandment requires a seventh part of time, and is so far moral, and not the particular day, which was ceremonial, had its origin in the Catholic Church. Coleman says that Dr. Bound was the first to promulgate this doctrine, in a book published in 1595. But Coleman was certainly incorrect in this, for the same doctrine was taught by Thomas Aquinas more than three centuries before Dr. Bound, and Dr. Heylyn attributed it to the schoolmen of the Middle Ages. It is found distinctly stated in the Catholic catechism entitled, “Abridgement of Christian Doctrine.” There is no room for just doubt that they who argue thus-and the majority of Protestant Sunday-keepers do so argue-are following the lead of the Papal doctors. When this writer says that the Sunday is not the Sabbath of the Old Testament, he means that it is not

required by, or does not grow out of, the Sabbath commandment in the Old Testament.*OGSO 91.5*

From the decided tone and substance of the above extracts, it may be thought that I have now entered upon a new line, and given the conclusion and the summary of some advocate of the seventh-day Sabbath. But not so. The expression “our Sunday” shows its origin. This is copied from a work, “History of Sunday,” by Rev. A. Grimlund, lately a Lutheran bishop of Norway. And the work itself was written to counteract the influence of Sabbath teachers, and to vindicate the action of the church in retaining a practice so well established by custom. Why, then, if such was his object, did he give such an overwhelming testimony against the Sunday, and so strongly vindicate the Sabbath? In return, I ask, How can anyone give a genuine history of Sunday and do otherwise? All honest historians-and of such I take Rev. Grimlund to be one-are compelled by the facts of the Bible and of history to defend the Sabbath and to condemn the Sunday. Their theological opinions and associations may lead in another direction; their choice might be of another conclusion; but that other conclusion they can never reach by any fair treatment of the Bible and of history. In their cases we are reminded of the prophecy of Balaam. He started out to serve the king of Moab, and to curse Israel; but the Spirit of God turned it into a blessing. Balaam, though his heart was not in union with the message of the Lord, was not yet entirely left of the Lord to follow his own way. And so of these: they are not in sympathy with the commandment of God; they start out to serve the Sunday; but the truth of God turns their witness into a vindication of the Sabbath. And I here state it as my firm conviction that when an individual who has ever been instructed in the truth on this subject, can no longer find evidence in the Bible to support the Sabbath of the Lord, and can find evidence in history to uphold Sunday, it is because the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of truth, has left him to his own way, to walk in the way of his own heart’s devisings.*OGSO 92.1*

HISTORY IS NOT BIBLE INTERPRETATION

I will here answer a question that has been proposed. It is said that the Reformers represented in the Augsburg Confession, and other authors quoted, were no-Sabbath men; they held that the Sabbath was entirely abrogated, and that it has no divine substitute in the gospel. In giving their testimony, do you not bind yourself to accept their conclusion, and to reject the Sabbath altogether? Or, why accept them in statement and deny their conclusion? In answering this I can but express my surprise that the questioners do not perceive any difference between an historical statement of fact, and a theological opinion. In accepting the history of Neander, I do not thereby bind myself to accept his theology. The Reformers were all raised in the bosom of the Catholic Church. They were piously trained from infancy to regard the seventh day as a Jewish Sabbath, and to call the Sunday the Lord's day. Now as to whether the Saviour abolished the ten commandments, and with them the Sabbath, is a theological question; it is only a matter of Scripture interpretation. In that we think the Reformers retained a grievous error of their early training; but that does not invalidate their testimony in regard to a matter of fact with which they were well acquainted.*OGSO 93.1*

In closing these remarks, I wish to say to the reader that I have quoted very little from history that has not already been quoted by the advocates of the Sabbath, while I have left unnoticed a vast amount of historical testimony that is well known to the readers of the writings of the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists. When a man says that the Sabbatarians, in searching two hundred years, have not been able to find an item of proof that the Papacy changed the Sabbath, much of the reflection is intended to fall on the Seventh-day Baptists; for they, and not the Adventists, have been advocating the Sabbath for two hundred years. But if such an one has any knowledge of the authors and the literature of the Seventh-day Baptists (and if he has not, he is without excuse), he knows that his assertion does great injustice to that denomination. Amongst their authors are numbered men eminent for ability, for education, and for deep research, not to speak of their evident piety and conscientious regard for the truth of God's word. They have laid before the world a large amount of rich instruction

from the Bible and from history on this important subject.*OGSO 94.1*

Now if I had exhausted the evidence; if no more historical proof could be given than appears in this tract, even then I could confidently appeal to the reader that the assertion quoted on page 9 is made in sheer recklessness. Never was a word more carelessly spoken than this, that Sabbatarians have never presented an item of historical evidence that the Papacy changed the Sabbath. I do not know how to palliate such a statement coming from one who has read “History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week,” by Elder J. N. Andrews.*OGSO 95.1*

I have avoided complicating my argument by noticing minor or incidental points. All minor points and objections can be easily met, but it has been my object to keep the main issue in view. It is, in every sense, a main issue. The remark that we consider this a material question, was not an exaggeration. We do indeed so consider it. And with the clear evidence before us that the Papacy did change the Sabbath, and the fact that the Sunday institution will in every feature meet the description of such an institution in *Revelation 13:11-17*, and that no other will, we are constrained to believe-we cannot avoid it-that the Sunday-sabbath is the burden of the awful warning found in *Revelation 14:19-11*. This is an issue that everyone will have to meet. It cannot always be turned aside with empty assertions. In the providence of God it is going to every nation. And men can do nothing against it. Let men oppose as they may, God’s counsel will stand; his law will be vindicated; it will be victorious; the call of the prophetic word will be heeded, and a company will take their stand on “the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,” who will be permitted to rejoice when the Son of man appears on the great white cloud to reap the harvest of the earth. *Revelation 14:12-16*.*OGSO 95.2*